Partnership Grants: Insights from a Former Committee Chair and Reviewer

Howard Ramos, Western University

Dalhousie University, November 4, 2021

SSHRC PG Program

- Two stage program
- Stage 1 –Proof of Concept, Project Budget not Adjudicated, some years need to explain stage 2 "development funds"
- Stage 2 –Demonstration of partnership, full development of project that can hit the ground running, interview with committee

SSHRC PG Program – Stage 1

- Documents to read before applying
- Application process
- Applicant (or lead organization for institutional grants)
- Activity details / research activities (mandatory)
- Description of team (mandatory)
- Invited partner organizations (mandatory)
- List of potential partner organizations and other contributors (if applicable)
- Summary of proposal (mandatory)
- List of references or bibliography (mandatory)
- Goal and project description (mandatory)
- Research-creation support material (if applicable)
- Funds requested from SSHRC (mandatory)
- Budget justification (mandatory)
- Funds from other sources
- Contributions plan (mandatory)
- Suggested reviewers
- Exclusion of potential reviewers (if applicable)
- Research contributions and relevant experience (mandatory)

SSHRC PG Program –Stage 2

Differences between stages

- Documents to read before applying
- Application process
- Applicant (or lead organization for institutional grants)
- Activity details / research activities (mandatory)
- → Invited partner organizations (mandatory)
- Summary of proposal (mandatory)
- Knowledge mobilization plan (mandatory)
- List of references or bibliography (mandatory)
- → Expected outcomes (mandatory)
- Goal and project description (mandatory)
- Research-creation support material (if applicable)
- → Description of formal partnership (mandatory)
- → Partnered chairs (if applicable)
- → Governance (mandatory)
- → Participants' involvement (mandatory)
- → Training and mentoring (mandatory)
- → Evidence of formal partnership (mandatory)
- List of potential partner organizations and other contributors (if applicable)
- Funds requested from SSHRC (mandatory)
- Budget justification (mandatory)
- Funds from other sources
- Total project cost
- Impact assessment—Appendix A
- → Contributions plan (mandatory)
- Exclusion of potential reviewers (if applicable)
- Research contributions and relevant experience (mandatory)

Advice on PG programs

- Three routes (Insight, Talent, Connection) –can be any combo
- Committee are non-specialists and meetings now online
- Files are huge, make them simple to follow
- Short summary is very important
- Longer summary should seed other components
- Symmetry and balance are important

Advice on PG programs

- Explaining 'why' and focusing on the partnership is important
- If building from a previous PDG or PG no need to grow partnerships but should explain evolution
- More is not always better
- $2.5 million over 4 or 7 years is not as much as it might seem
- SSHRC requires a 35% minimum cash and/or in-kind contributions

Advice on PG programs

- Cash funds from universities most important, cash from partners second, in-kind from each third
- Significant funds for student training is seen well as well as to community partner development
- Partner letters more meaningful when not a template
- Partnership more meaningful if relationship can be shown

Advice on PG programs

- Stage 2 involves interview and best if partners also speak and setting up look and feel

- Governance is important and one that has some hierarchy

- Research contributions and past experience should show experience with larger parentships of PI or team

Advice on PG programs

- Knowledge mobilization should include academic dissemination and is not just a contest for social media and public outreach

- Opportunities for students and early career researchers is important and mentorship of each

- New to the competition is assessment of Equity Diversity and Inclusion across research, partners, and people

Questions?

Wela'lin/Merci/Thank you!

howard.ramos@uwo.ca