

## **Guidelines and Procedures for the Research and Development Committee**

### **Membership**

Membership for the Research and Development Committee is established by a nomination and election procedure to occur in the Spring of the preceding year. The membership of the Committee should reflect the diversity, scope, and breadth of Faculty and members should be active researchers/publishers. The Committee shall be comprised of:

- Chair
- Three faculty members
- Associate Dean, Graduate Programmes and Research (ex officio)

### **Eligibility for funding**

The following members of the Faculty of Education are eligible to receive awards from this programme:

- Tenured faculty members
- Tenured-track faculty members;
- Regular term appointments
- Post-doctoral fellows who hold an appointment with the Faculty of Education

Individuals appointed on a per-course basis are not eligible but may collaborate with a faculty member. Individuals with regular term appointments must take up the award at the time of their appointment; access to funds will only be available for the duration of the appointment.

While there is no restriction on how often eligible applicants may apply, priority will be given to applicants who did not apply or were not successful in the preceding competition.

Persons serving on the Research and Development Committee are not eligible to receive funding in the academic year for which they are members of the Committee.

### **Submitting a proposal**

The committee will adjudicate applications once a year, in the Fall. The dates will be communicated to potential applicants at least two months in advance.

Proposals shall be received by the Office of Graduate Programs and Research (Education) no later than midnight (Labrador time) of the deadline. The Office may contact the applicant if there appear to be missing pages, corrupt files, or simple calculation errors, such as in the budget. Committee members may not directly contact applicants. All contact during the adjudication process will be through the Office of Graduate Programs and Research (Education).

## Budgets and expenses

### *Amount of funding*

The Dean of Education shall establish a maximum total amount of funding to be dispersed by the Committee. The current total amount available for the competition is \$15,000.

The Committee will normally provide assistance to a maximum of \$3000 towards short-term research and development projects undertaken by faculty members. As much as possible, awards will be “seed money” to initiate projects for which external funding is being sought. Where warranted and when funds are available, the committee can recommend up to \$4000. Proposals already funded by this or other competitions are not eligible for funding.

Funding accounts for approved proposals must be activated within 6 months of the date of the award

The funding account will remain open for a maximum of two years. Extensions to the timeline may be considered as per Tri-Council guidelines.

### *Eligible and ineligible expenses*

Eligible expenses follow the regulations for SSHRC Explore Grants (formally known as SSHRC/VP Research Grants).

Following the regulations for the SSHRC Explore Grants ineligible expenses include: faculty members’ thesis work, faculty professional development activities, faculty curriculum development, preparation of textbooks, conference travel, or normally, the purchase of capital equipment.

Except as noted above, all other budgetary expenses are to conform to the current Tri-Agency Financial Administration Guide. The following Tri-Agency link will direct you to the most up-to-date version of the 2017 Tri-Agency Financial Guide which will also outline any current and subsequent future updates:

[http://www.science.gc.ca/eic/site/063.nsf/eng/h\\_97415.html](http://www.science.gc.ca/eic/site/063.nsf/eng/h_97415.html)

And are subject to normal University policies and procedures for the administration of research funds.

However, those seeking travel/conference funds may explore other sources of funding such as SSHRC Exchange (previously known as Travel Funds).

## Adjudication criteria

### *Criteria*

Adjudication of proposals is guided by criteria designed to ensure consistent and comprehensive appraisals. At the same time, the adjudication criteria are sufficiently flexible in order to uphold the principle of supporting diverse forms of research and development. These criteria might reference, for example, a theoretical framework, research methodologies, literature reviews, methods, visiting scholars, guest lecturers,

community engagement initiatives, etc. Consequently, proposals to the Committee are adjudicated on the criteria of comprehensibility, coherence, feasibility, accountability, and contribution to furthering faculty research interests. These criteria are explained further in Appendix A.

In making a submission, it is important to recognize that not all Committee members will have an intimate knowledge of the subject matter of all proposals. Consequently, the onus is on the applicant to write in clear, plain language that will explain the proposal in a manner that is readily understood. Avoid jargon, acronyms and highly technical terms.

### *Emerging scholars*

Emerging scholars will be given preference for funding. If two proposals (one from an established and one from an emerging scholar) are deemed worthy of funding by the Committee but limited funds do not allow funding of both proposals, the priority will be given to the 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 requesting consideration as an emerging scholar must identify themselves as such and demonstrate that they have not applied successfully, as principal investigator or project director, for a grant from any of the programmes sponsored by the Tri-Agency.

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

- i. Completed their highest degree no more than five years before the competition deadline (SSHRC considers only the date of completion of the first doctorate);
- ii. Held a tenured or tenure-track university appointment for less than five years;
- iii. Held a university appointment but never a tenure-track position;
- iv. Had their careers significantly interrupted or delayed for family or medical reasons.

### *Feedback*

The Committee shall provide detailed feedback on unsuccessful proposals that indicates how the proposal can be improved for the next funding competition. Applicants re-submitting a proposal are encouraged to provide a response to the feedback they received in their earlier proposal. The Faculty's Grants Facilitator can provide applicants with one-on-one assistance prior to their submission. As well support can be provided to improve the application for resubmission.

### *Appeals*

Decisions of the Committee are not subject to appeal with the following exceptions:

- i. Where there is evidence of a procedural error in the adjudication process.  
Examples of a procedural error include: part of the proposal was not copied or a member of the Committee was funded.
- ii. Where there is evidence that a Committee based its decision on factual error.

In such instances, the applicant can make an appeal in writing to the Dean of Education.

## **Dissemination**

Those receiving awards are required to give a faculty seminar/workshop/presentation etc. on their research/projects. The Dean's Office will provide support for the seminars and schedule them as appropriate. Those recipients whose projects cannot be typically disseminated (e.g., visiting scholar, etc.) are expected to inform the committee of the outcome of the award. Faculty must disseminate their research as described above in order to be considered for future funding.

## Appendix A – Adjudication criteria

CRITERIA	GUIDING QUESTIONS	COMMENTS ( <i>sample comments</i> )
Comprehensibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear to the Committee what the proposal is communicating?</li> <li>• Is the proposal written in a language that is understandable to a Committee member not working in that specific area? Is it <i>written in clear, plain language, avoiding jargon, acronyms and highly technical terms</i>?</li> <li>• Does the proposal discuss a theoretical framework, research methodology, literature review, method, etc. as applicable to the type of research being proposed?</li> </ul>	<p><i>The objectives and benefits of the project are not clear.</i></p> <p><i>The Committee did not understand the technical language in the Methods section.</i></p>
Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a logical match between the study or development opportunity's purpose, aims, projected outcomes methods and foreseeable benefits?</li> <li>• Is it complete -- are all sections present?</li> </ul>	<p><i>There is no information provided on data analysis or how participants will be recruited.</i></p> <p><i>The study proposes to assess students' perceptions yet data collection focuses only on instructors.</i></p>
Feasibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the amount of funding requested adequate for the scope of the study/project?</li> <li>• Does the budget allow for the study to be completed?</li> <li>• Is the timeframe adequate?</li> </ul>	<p><i>The proposal indicates that interviews will be conducted with 40 teachers. The Committee felt that this scope was too large for the budget.</i></p>
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there plans for dissemination?</li> <li>• Is the project/research likely to have an impact on practice, theory, policy or local knowledge?</li> <li>• Is the project/research likely to create research capacity (e.g., hiring of new researchers)?</li> </ul>	<p><i>The proposal does not include any opportunity to build research capacity by hiring students.</i></p> <p><i>It is not clear how the guest speaker will stimulate faculty research interests.</i></p>
Contribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the study fill a gap in the literature or in knowledge?</li> <li>• Why is the study needed?</li> <li>• How will this development opportunity contribute to faculty interests?</li> </ul>	<p><i>The brief literature review did not make clear how the proposed study might advance knowledge in the area.</i></p> <p><i>It is difficult to discern the overall benefit of the proposed workshop or community engagement project.</i></p>