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Agenda

1. Workshop #1 recap and reminders
2. IDG Adjudication Process
3. Research summaries
4. Internal review feedback
5. Open discussion / Q&A / grant assistance
Workshop # 1 – recap and reminders
October IDG Workshop # 1

- supports for applicants
- overview of IDG
- critical application components
- tips and resources

IDG Objectives:

- To support research in its *initial stages* conducted by emerging and/or established scholars
- To enable the development of *new research questions*, as well as *experimentation* with new methods, theoretical approaches, and/or ideas
  - may include case studies, pilot initiatives, and critical analyses of existing research
Emerging Scholar Category

**Emerging scholar:** An emerging scholar is someone who has not yet had the opportunity to establish an extensive record of research achievement, but is in the process of building one.

**Applicants** identifying themselves as an emerging scholar must demonstrate that they have not applied successfully, as principal investigator or project director, for a grant offered through SSHRC, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, or the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

In addition, they must meet at least one of the following criteria:

1. have completed their highest degree no more than six years before the competition deadline (SSHRC considers only the date of completion of the first doctorate); or
2. have held a tenured or tenure-track university appointment for less than six years; or
3. have held a university appointment, but never a tenure-track position (in the case of institutions that offer tenure-track positions); or
4. have had their careers significantly interrupted or delayed for health or family reasons within the past six years.
Changes to the 2016 IDG

• 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

• Collaborator CV not required; will receive an invitation to participate and will have to fill out a brief profile
Update on IDG Success Rates

- **Unsuccessful**
  - 2011: 384
  - 2012: 607
  - 2013: 722
  - 2014: 843
  - 2015: 951

- **Awarded**
  - 2011: 246
  - 2012: 329
  - 2013: 306
  - 2014: 285
  - 2015: 286

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDG Year</th>
<th>UofS Success Rate</th>
<th>National Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IDG Adjudication Process
Evaluation Criteria

Challenge: The aim and importance of the endeavour (50%)
  e.g. - originality, significance, expected contribution
  - appropriateness of literature review, theoretical framework, methods
  - quality of training / mentoring
  - potential for impact within and beyond scholarly community

Feasibility: The plan to achieve excellence (20%)
  e.g. - probability objectives will be met within proposed timeline
  - appropriateness of budget, and any in-kind contributions
  - knowledge mobilization plans

Capability: The expertise to succeed (30%)
  e.g. - quality/quantity of previous outputs
  - evidence of knowledge mobilization activities
  - evidence of HQP training/ contributions to development of talent
  - potential to make future contributions
Evaluation and Adjudication

A single-stage committee review process

- does not involve external ‘peer review’ assessments.

Adjudication committees

- national and international scholars
- may include experts from other sectors as needed
Research Groups / Committees

On the application form asked to indicate which of the five groups you consider most appropriate for your proposal, and to select a primary discipline and area of research from a detailed list.

**Group 1:** History; medieval studies; classics; literature; fine arts; philosophy; religious studies; and related fields.

**Group 2:** Anthropology; archaeology; linguistics; translation; political science; public administration; geography; urban planning and environmental studies; and related fields.

**Group 3:** Business and management; economics; and related fields.

**Group 4:** Sociology; demography; law; criminology; social work; communication studies; journalism; media studies; gender studies; cultural studies; library and information science; and related fields.

**Group 5:** Education; psychology; career guidance; and related fields.
What About Multidisciplinary Evaluation?

☐ Request for Multidisciplinary Evaluation (yes/no)
  ☐ If “Yes” complete the TEXT BOX (max 3800 characters)
    ▪ This document will be used by SSHRC staff in determining the most appropriate review for your application.

- SSHRC will create disciplinary, multidisciplinary and/or thematic adjudication committees according to the number and nature of applications received, and taking into account information provided by applicants.

- Applicants who prefer a multidisciplinary review will be asked to indicate secondary and tertiary disciplines and areas of research relating to their proposal, and to include a rationale.

- SSHRC will create one multidisciplinary committee per research group, provided the number of applications received is sufficient. Relevant expertise may be sought to review the proposal from within the larger pool of IDG committee membership.
What About Aboriginal Research?

☐ Does your project involve Aboriginal Research? (yes/no)
  ▪ If you select “Yes” your application may be assigned to a dedicated committee for evaluation.

▪ Adjudication of Aboriginal research proposals involves a more tailored adjudication.

▪ If a sufficient number of Aboriginal research applications are received, SSHRC may establish distinct adjudication committees.

▪ SSHRC’s Guidelines for the Merit Review of Aboriginal Research are relevant for researchers who are applying for a SSHRC grant to conduct Aboriginal research. ("research by and with Aboriginal Peoples vs research on and for Aboriginal Peoples")

▪ SSHRC relies on a community of merit reviewers with experience and expertise in Aboriginal research to judge the extent to which the guidelines may be applied to a particular research proposal.
1. Challenge—The aim and importance of the endeavour:
   - Given the emphasis placed on lived experience, both written and oral literature are appropriate forms of knowledge for consideration. Examples of oral literature can include interviews or personal encounters, or traditional teaching with elders.
   - Theoretical framework and methodology may be combined. For example, in storytelling, the stories represent in some instances both theory and method, a way of explaining phenomena or illustrating how behaviour or actions contribute to living in a good way.
   - Community involvement and the co-creation of knowledge, as appropriate, are considered essential, especially in data interpretation. In this context, the co-creation of knowledge could include interpretative approaches that are jointly developed, reviewed and confirmed by and with community members or their community-delegated organization.
   - Where appropriate, priority should be given to Aboriginal students and postdoctoral researchers when training opportunities are offered.

2. Feasibility—The plan to achieve excellence:
   - The research should address the needs of each partner, if applicable, and demonstrate how the research meets these identified needs.
   - The application should demonstrate how outputs will be made available to, and potentially used by, Aboriginal Peoples and other stakeholders, with community benefits configured into the research outputs. Examples of outreach may include: websites, videos, presentations, artistic or community exhibits, performances, or festivals.
   - The availability and nature of organizational or administrative infrastructure varies from community to community. This aspect should be considered in the structuring of the research in ways that acknowledge and maximize the contributions of a community partner organization.
   - Where required by the funding opportunity, the leveraging of cash and/or in-kind support from host institutions and partners can include social capital, an asset that may emphasize social and familial relationships and networks and may affect the cost of research. Furthermore, linguistic capital, the ability to engage in the community with the ancestral language(s) of the community and a national language of Canada, can also be considered as a contribution.
   - Expectations about the management and governance of the coproduction and outputs of knowledge and related support, during and beyond the award, should be outlined.
3. Capability—The expertise to succeed:

- The career and academic stages, as well as the rates of research and publication contributions, of applicants and team members need to be reviewed with respect to the following considerations:
  - Aboriginal scholars may have had to start their academic path later in life, or have had interruptions.
  - For some scholars, there are expectations that they significantly contribute to and engage with their home community.
  - Applicants’ accountability to their postsecondary community is also important, as demonstrated by Aboriginal scholars providing support that could include providing student support, teacher training, committee work, and cultural sensitivity training to non-Aboriginal scholars; and contributing to the incorporation of Aboriginal knowledge systems, language, culture and experiences into their postsecondary institutions, including through the creation of associated programs.
  - In the Special Circumstances section, reviewers should take into account the degree of difficulty in an applicant’s career as a useful measure of merit, especially where they have succeeded in overcoming career obstacles.
  - The relevant experience of Aboriginal scholars should take into account the life/knowledge journey of individuals.
Research Summaries
Research Summary

1) Sales pitch
2) Three reviewers on the adjudication committee will read entire application; others will rely on summary
3) Summary as refresher
Effective Research Summary

Contains the following:

- Context
- Problem and significance
- Proposed solution
- Main objectives
- Expected contributions to knowledge and societal benefits
- Wider potential benefits
Key Elements

Succinct overview

Clear, plain language

Non-technical terms

• Should be understood by people from a range of backgrounds

• SSHRC may use the summary for promotional purposes outside the research community: avoid academic terminology and references to methodology
Key Elements

Convincing and persuasive

- answers “so what?”
- engages readers immediately with a strong opening statement/question
- engages reader throughout
  - strong, clear language
  - effective word choices
  - clear, effective writing (read out loud)
  - Essay Writing 101 (thesis; grammar; sentence structure; paragraphs; adverbs – additionally, further; clarity)
- easy to understand → easy to remember
Discussion / Q&A / Grant Assistance