2015 INSIGHT Grant Supports

1. Workshop #1 – 29th July
   • overview and practical tools
2. Application Development – ongoing
   • work with your Research Facilitator
3. Internal Review – 15th August (request by 15th July)
   • peer and RF review based on SSHRC criteria
4. Workshop #2 – 14th September
   • responding to internal review feedback; effective proposal summaries; polishing your SSHRC IG application
Agenda

1. Overview of Insight Grant (IG)
   - Getting Started
   - Application Components
2. Adjudication
3. Tips and Resources
4. Questions
IG: Aims & Objectives

• “The Insight program aims to support and foster excellence in social sciences and humanities research intended to deepen, widen and increase our collective understanding of individuals and societies, as well as to inform the search for solutions to societal challenges.”
IG: Aims & Objectives

• Build knowledge and understanding from disciplinary, interdisciplinary and/or cross-sector perspectives

• Support new approaches to research on complex and important topics, including those that transcend the capacity of any one scholar, institution or discipline

• Provide high-quality research training experience for students
IG: Aims & Objectives

• Fund research expertise that relates to societal challenges and opportunities

• Mobilize research knowledge, to and from academic and non-academic audiences, with the potential to lead to intellectual, cultural, social and economic influence, benefit and impact
Round Table: Aims & Objectives

• What are you thinking about in terms of your aims and objectives?

• Recipient / Reviewer insights:
  o pitching the purpose of your grant

"So - Pizza again?"
Is this the Right Grant for You?

**INSIGHT**
- Projects from 3 – 5 years
- Any stage of research
- $7,000 to $400,000
- All researchers evaluated equally

**INSIGHT DEVELOPMENT**
- Projects from 1 – 2 years
- Initial stage of research
- $7,000 - $75,000
- Emerging scholars evaluated differently than established researchers
IG / IDG Grant Holding Restriction

• Cannot apply as the PI for an IG and an IDG in the same calendar year; i.e. a researcher who
  o applied for an IDG in February 2015 cannot apply for an IG in October 2015
  o applies for an IG in October 2015 may apply for an IDG in February 2016 provided the objectives are different

• Can hold an IDG and an IG grant at the same time provided the objectives are different

• No limit to participating as a co-applicant or collaborator
National IG Success Rates

- 2014: 27%
- 2013: 21%
- 2012: 23%
Changes to the 2015 IG

• Notice of Intent no longer required
• Maximum $400,000; $100,000 per year
• Collaborator CV not required; will receive an invitation to participate and will have to fill out a brief profile
• New criteria for emerging scholar (though no special status or separate envelope of $):
  o cannot hold previous funding from any Tri-Agency
  o qualifying period extended from five to six years
Changes to the 2015 IG

• Aboriginal research:
  o **definition** revised
  o new **merit review guidelines** to ensure fair and equitable review of Aboriginal research
  o new **Aboriginal Research Statement of Principles**

• New: resources for preparing an Insight **Research Creation** application
IG APPLICATION COMPONENTS
• For full details see the description of the **Insight Grant** with access to the application form, instructions and SSHRC CV
Insight Grant in Printout Order

1) Identification
2) Participants
3) Research Activity
4) Request for Multi / Interdisciplinary Evaluation (1 page)
5) Response to Previous Critiques (1 page)
6) Summary of Proposal (3800 characters; app. 1 page)
7) Detailed Description (6 pages)
8) List of References (10 pages)
9) Knowledge Mobilization Plan (1 page)
10) Expected Outcomes (1 page)
11) Research Team, Previous Output, Student Training (1 pages)
12) Funds Requested from SSHRC
13) Budget Justification (2 pages)
14) Funds From Other Sources
15) Suggested Assessors
16) Exclusion of Potential Assessors (1 page)
17) SSHRC CV
18) Research Contributions (4 pages)
19) Research-Creation Support Material (1 page)
20) Appendix A (Environmental Impact) and Appendix B (CEAA Pre-Screening Checklist)
Request for Multi / Interdisciplinary Evaluation

- Selecting this option will result in a review committee with members of very diverse backgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-disciplinary</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Avoid jargon at all costs and write for a general audience
- Maximum one page
Round Table

- Recipient / Reviewer insights:
  - selecting your adjudication committee
Response to Previous Critiques

• Optional but recommended, provided…
  o you have something positive to say about how it improved your proposal
  o detail how you have addressed previous critiques in the revised application

• Maximum one page
Summary

• Technically, not evaluated, but critical because:
  o only part of your application every committee member will read
  o all committee members involved in the ranking of each application

• Think of it as a stand-alone document

• Best not to cut and paste from your proposal

• Write so the general public will understand what you have planned….and why it’s original, important and feasible

• Describe the problem or issue to be addressed, the potential contribution of the research in terms of the advancement of knowledge and the wider social benefit
Detailed Description

• Here you demonstrate the importance, originality and anticipated contribution to the advancement of knowledge of your proposed research

• Described in three main sections (and use these as headings):
  o objectives
  o context
  o methodology

• Maximum six pages
Knowledge Mobilization

• Detail specific activities and tools including new digital technologies, Open Access and plans to engage the various stakeholders

• Incorporate knowledge mobilization into training
  • Involve your students in the KM activities

• Explain / demonstrate the impact

• Maximum one page

• New: Guidelines for Effective Knowledge Mobilization
Expected Outcomes

• Here you elaborate on the impact your research contributions will have on your stakeholders and other researchers

• Maximum one page
Research Team, Previous Output and Student Training

• The last piece of substantial text the reviewer will read
• Ends on training
  o a good place to herald past successes and gesture to the ones that will come from the work proposed
• Maximum four pages
Involving Trainees

Effective research training:

• Builds both academic competencies and general professional skills that would be transferable to a variety of settings

• Includes international and/or intersectoral opportunities whenever possible and applicable

• Includes specific, effective mentoring and institutional support

• SSHRC’s Guidelines for Effective Research Training
Round Table

• Key strategies for success:
  o Knowledge mobilization
  o Communicating impact / benefit
  o HQP training

• Recipient / Reviewer insights
Assessors

• Suggested Assessors
  o Think carefully about who can evaluate your work effectively
  o Best suggestions are your peers; i.e. who else publishes similar work?

• Exclusion of Potential Assessors
  o Be sure to provide a reasonable explanation for any exclusions
  o Maximum one page
Research Contributions

• Highlight any great impacts your work has had

• Include, in this order:
  1. Relevant Research Contributions Over the Last Six Years (2009-2015)
  2. Other Research Contributions
  3. Most Significant Career Research Contributions
  4. Career Interruptions and Special Circumstances
  5. Contributions to Training

• Maximum four pages
THE BUDGET
Formulating Your Insight Grant Budget

• Personnel costs
  o student
  o non-student

• Travel and subsistence costs
  o applicant / team member(s)
  o Students

• Other expenses
  o professional / technical services
  o supplies and non-disposable equipment
Your Budget Justification

“Committees may consider failing a project on the **Feasibility** criteria if they deem that 30 per cent or more of the overall budget request is insufficiently justified and/or not appropriate to the proposed objectives or outcomes of the project.”

SSHRC Manual for Adjudication Committee Members 2014-15, p.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average (total) grant request</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>180,860</td>
<td>191,899</td>
<td>202,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your Budget *Justification*

- **Purpose:**
  - details how much, for what *and* how proposed expenditures relate directly to your objectives / methods

- Bear in mind SSHRC’s principle of minimum essential funding

- Maximum two pages
A good budget justification...

- Makes things match!
  - same numbers as in the budget table
  - costs relate directly to your objectives and methods
- Aligns personnel roles and expertise
- Relates personnel to specific tasks
Example 1: Tabular Format

**Personnel Costs:** Two doctoral students (at Brock University and the University of Saskatchewan) will assist with fieldwork, analyze the data, and write up the research. Multiple researchers are necessary to ensure triangulation and to extend the analysis through a range of interpretations (Stake, 2005). The graduate students add an additional researcher to each case. Doctoral students have the necessary data collection and analytical skills to contribute fully to this project. In addition, they will benefit from being involved in one project for three years, from inception to completion. (See “Student Training.”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Basis of Calculation</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral students</td>
<td>2@18,000 each/yr + mandatory benefits@8.06%</td>
<td>38,902</td>
<td>38,902</td>
<td>38,902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 2: Text Format

PERSONNEL COSTS ($90,000)

Non-student salaries and benefits/stipends ($90,000)

Post-doctoral stipend – A post-doctoral fellow (PDF) will be recruited for this project to assist with participant recruitment and queries, contribute to project management, coordinate data collection, implement the interventions in both studies, lead data analysis related to intervention effects, and participate in knowledge mobilization activities. The stipend rate complies with those of UofS and our provincial health research funding agency, the Saskatchewan Health Research Foundation (SHRF).

Expenditure (Yrs 2 and 3): stipend $45,000/yr x 2 years = $90,000.
Adjudication

- Challenge
  - the aim and importance of the endeavour (40%)
- Feasibility
  - the plan to achieve excellence (20%)
- Capability
  - the expertise to succeed (40%)
- Evaluation and Adjudication

Are you—and your CV—ready to take this project on?
Round Table

- Adjudication process
- Reviewer/committee insights
TIPS & RESOURCES
Tips

• Start early!

• Know what’s required and what’s involved: read the program description, application instructions and the evaluation criteria

• Include students
Tips

• Make full use of these resources:
  o UofS Internal Review
  o Research Facilitator
  o Previous UofS recipients and adjudicators
  o SSHRC’s Resource Centre for Grants
  o SSHRC Insight Program Officers
    insightgrants@sshrc-crsh.gc.ca
    613-996-6976
Questions?