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I. Purpose of the Manual

Adjudication committees play a vital role in the operations of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). More than 40 adjudication committees, totalling close to 300 committee members, adjudicate applications in the various SSHRC programs that provide support for research, research training, research communication and knowledge transfer.

This manual:

1. provides adjudication committees with summary information on SSHRC’s objectives, structure, policies and programs;
2. sets out policies and procedures for the adjudication of applications submitted to the Standard Research Grants program; and
3. encourages uniformity and consistency in the application of SSHRC’s policies and principles across adjudication committees.

Complete information for all SSHRC programs—including program guides, eligibility and evaluation criteria, application instructions and submission deadlines—is available on SSHRC’s Web site at:

www.sshrc.ca
II. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

1. Role and Objectives

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) is the federal agency responsible for promoting and supporting advanced scholarly research and research training in the social sciences and humanities in Canada through grants and fellowships programs.

Created in June 1977 by an Act of Parliament, SSHRC obtains its funds through an annual Parliamentary vote and reports to Parliament through the Minister of Industry. SSHRC’s total budget for the support of its programs and activities in the 2006-07 fiscal year is $306 million. The Council functions as an arm’s-length agency and has full authority to determine its priorities, policies and programs and to make funding decisions.

In broad terms, SSHRC's objectives are to:

- support research and training that can help us to understand a rapidly changing human society;
- promote knowledge sharing among research producers and users in many different sectors to help them tackle emerging issues and opportunities.

2. Governing Structure

SSHRC is governed by an appointed Council consisting of a president and 22 members who represent the academic community and other sectors of society. The president is appointed for a five-year term. Council members are normally appointed for three years. Both the president and Council members are eligible for reappointment.

The president is SSHRC's chief executive officer and presides over Council meetings. The vice-president is elected by the Council to assist the president as requested, or to replace the chief executive in the event of absence or incapacity.

The Council is assisted in its work by six standing committees: the Executive Committee, the Audit Committee, the Research Support Committee, the Fellowships and Career Development Committee, the Performance and Evaluation Committee and the Ethics and Integrity Committee.

The Executive Committee has full authority to act for the Council and to deal with urgent matters that arise between Council meetings. It also reviews long-term directions and priorities submitted by the President and makes recommendations to Council on budget allocations.

The Audit Committee approves audit plans, reviews and makes recommendations on audit reports, evaluates SSHRC’s financial performance, and reviews evaluation reports.

The Research Support Committee and the Fellowships and Career Development Committee serve as links between the Council and its adjudication committees. Each committee consists of four Council members and four external members. They monitor the functioning of the peer-review process in the programs within their purview and offer advice on the continuing effectiveness and pertinence of these programs. The Research Support Committee makes recommendations to Council concerning all SSHRC's research support and dissemination programs and policies, taking into account Council’s priorities, strategic plans and national and international research thrusts.
The Fellowships and Career Development Committee advises Council on SSHRC’s research training programs and addresses issues related to preparing the next generation of researchers through the various forms of direct and indirect support to graduate students. Observers from these committees may attend adjudication meetings or participate in teleconferences.

The Performance and Evaluation Committee helps SSHRC develop and implement a results-based accountability framework, as well as a variety of evaluations at the policy, program and project levels. The Committee reviews recommendations arising from these evaluation frameworks and reports to and advises Council on these issues.

The Ethics and Integrity Committee provides policy advice to Council and administrative advice to staff concerning ethics and integrity issues in humanities and social sciences research.

3. Program Structure

SSHRC’s Programs Branch consists of three separate divisions: the Strategic Programs and Joint Initiatives Division, the Fellowships and Institutional Grants Division, and the Research and Dissemination Grants Division. These divisions are responsible for the administration of independent grants and fellowships programs.

SSHRC also administers the Initiative on the New Economy (INE) through the INE Steering Committee and the INE Secretariat.

A staff directory, as well as a chart illustrating the structure of SSHRC committees, is available on SSHRC’s Web site (www.sshrc.ca).
III. Fundamental Principles for Adjudicators

The principles set out in the following sections apply to all members of SSHRC adjudication committees and are vital to maintaining the well-established tradition of integrity and transparency in the conduct of Council business and peer review.

1. Confidentiality

Access to Information Act and Privacy Act

All information provided to SSHRC is subject to the Access to Information Act and to the Privacy Act.

In order to assist SSHRC in complying with the Privacy Act, adjudication committee members sign a declaration in which they ensure the confidentiality of information in all applications for grants and fellowships. The purpose of the Act is to protect the privacy of individuals with respect to personal information about themselves held by government institutions and to provide individuals with a right of access to that information. The Privacy Act also stipulates that, without the consent of the individual to whom it relates, personal information obtained shall not be used except for the purpose for which it was collected or for a use consistent with that purpose.

All information gathered by SSHRC is used for reviewing applications, administering grants or awards, establishing data bases for program planning and evaluation, and developing banks of potential external assessors and adjudication committee members. It is also used, if necessary, for consultations with the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) and the Canada Council concerning the eligibility of the proposed activity, and may be used for statistical studies conducted by SSHRC on research funding in Canada.

In the case of research funded under one of SSHRC’s Joint Initiatives, personal information is disclosed to the named funding partner for purposes of monitoring and evaluating the program.

In the research support programs, competition results are forwarded to university research administration officers who are responsible for processing applications from their institutions before sending them to SSHRC, for administering the grants, and for informing candidates of the outcome of their applications. Only in the MCRI and Postdoctoral Fellowship programs does SSHRC inform candidates directly of the outcome of their applications.

In the Doctoral Awards program, competition results are forwarded to faculties of graduate studies, which are responsible for pre-screening applications from their institutions before sending them to Council.

Committee members should direct any questions or concerns about the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act to SSHRC’s Access to Information and Privacy Coordinator (613-992-0562).
SSHRC Grant and Fellowship Applications

Information in applications is the intellectual property of the applicant and is protected. In handling applicant/application information, Committee members must adhere to these requirements:

- Information placed in the custody of committee members is to be used only for the purpose for which it was collected—the evaluation of SSHRC applications. No other use is permitted.
- All copies of documents must be secured to maintain confidentiality. In addition, material that a committee member no longer requires must be destroyed in a secure manner, i.e., burning or shredding. All binders, files and assessments must be left on SSHRC premises at the conclusion of the meetings. For adjudications by teleconference, committee members should ensure that the documents are destroyed after results have been announced. Similarly, any member's work that has been saved as a computer file or on diskette must be deleted.

Reviewer Identity

Applicants for SSHRC grants and fellowships have the right of access to personal information about them stored in SSHRC files. Under the provisions of the Privacy Act, the name of the external assessor or appraiser of an application for SSHRC funding constitutes personal information about the assessor, not the applicant. Applicants have access to the full text of the external assessments in the research support programs, with the exception of the name of the assessor and any comments made regarding other applicants and their identities. In the fellowships programs, the full texts of letters of appraisal, departmental appraisals and research appraisals are available to the applicant, with the exception of the names of the individuals who wrote the letters and any comments made regarding other applicants and their identities.

In order to protect committee members from possible pressure from applicants, members' identities are kept confidential until after results have been announced. Committee membership lists are available to applicants on request, following Council's ratification and official announcement of award results. The lists are also published in SSHRC's Annual Report to Parliament following the end of each fiscal year.

Committee Deliberations

All matters discussed during adjudication meetings or teleconferences are confidential. Following Council's approval of committee recommendations, it is the responsibility of SSHRC staff to notify applicants of the results of committee deliberations. Committee members must not disclose results prior to their official release by SSHRC. If approached by an applicant concerning a decision, committee members should decline to discuss the matter and advise the enquirer to contact SSHRC directly.

2. Managing Conflicts of Interest

SSHRC recognizes that real or perceived conflicts of interest can and do arise in the adjudication of grant and fellowship applications. SSHRC's position is that these situations must be managed in an open and transparent manner. Committee members are responsible for identifying and addressing real or apparent conflicts of interest in order to maintain the community's confidence and trust and to ensure accountability.
A committee member is considered to be in a conflict of interest vis-à-vis an application if it is from a team that includes:

- a close friend,
- a relative,
- a research collaborator,
- an institutional colleague,
- a former thesis supervisor or mentor,
- a student previously under the member's supervision,
- a person with whom the member is involved in a dispute,
- a person with whom the member is involved in a partnership.

In the MCRI program, a committee member is also considered to be in a conflict of interest situation with respect to an application if the project director is from the same university as the committee member.

In the Aid to Research Workshops and Conferences in Canada program, a committee member is considered to be in a conflict of interest situation if she or he has been invited to participate in the conference or congress as a speaker.

In the Doctoral Awards and Postdoctoral Fellowships programs, a committee member is also considered to be in a conflict of interest situation vis-à-vis an application if it is from:

- a student whom he or she is supervising or has supervised,
- a student for whom he or she has written a letter of appraisal.

While the Council cannot anticipate all potential conflict of interest situations, SSHRC staff make every effort to avoid possible conflicts before assigning applications to committee members for review. It is the responsibility of members to declare any conflict of interest related to an application and to inform SSHRC staff immediately of the conflict. It is the role of the program officer to advise the committee in ambiguous cases.

In adjudication meetings or teleconferences, a member declaring a conflict must withdraw from the room or conference call during the committee's discussion of the application in question. In cases where the chair of a committee withdraws because of a conflict of interest, the committee will designate an alternate chair for its review of the particular file(s).

A committee member who submits an application to the committee on which he or she is serving must withdraw from the committee in the year in which the application is submitted. However, the member may resume service on the committee in a subsequent year. In some Strategic Grants programs, a committee member who appears on an application as a co-investigator or collaborator may continue to serve on the committee, but must withdraw from the room during discussion of the application.

3. Ethics and Integrity in Research

**Ethics in Research Involving Humans**

In August 1998, the three federal granting agencies (SSHRC, CIHR and NSERC) released to the university community the *Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*. This policy statement seeks to articulate ethical norms for research activities sponsored by the councils which involve humans. It outlines guiding principles and basic standards that are intended to guide institutional ethics review bodies in their examination of SSHRC grant proposals for research involving human subjects. The full text of the *Policy Statement* can be found on the SSHRC Web site.
SSHRC no longer requires applicants to submit a research ethics certificate with their application. The responsibility for ensuring that all proposed research meets the ethics guidelines set by the granting councils now rests with the universities. Universities may only disburse SSHRC grant funds to award holders after the appropriate institutional ethics review bodies have examined the research proposals and have ensured that they meet the ethical principles of the Policy Statement.

Notwithstanding an institutional ethics review, SSHRC reserves the right to make final judgments concerning the ethics of research proposals submitted for funding. Adjudication committees may comment on research ethics and members are encouraged to raise questions of ethics for committee discussion if they have concerns about proposed methods of research.

**Integrity in Research and Scholarship**

*Integrity in Research and Scholarship: A Tri-Council Policy Statement* defines the policies and expectations of the councils with regard to integrity in a manner consistent with encouraging the highest standards of research and scholarship. It also sets out procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in research and scholarship.

The following principle concerning adjudication committees is included in this document (in the final section, entitled “Procedures for Promoting Integrity and for Preventing and Addressing Misconduct in Research – 3. Research Funding Councils”):

“In the event that a Council, or one of its peer review committees, identifies evidence of misconduct as part of the peer review processes, the Council will request the institution(s) involved to carry out an enquiry and to inform the Council of the outcome.”

Committee members should inform the SSHRC program officer of any concerns they may have regarding misconduct on the part of a grant or fellowship applicant.

4. **Non-Discrimination Policy**

No persons meeting the eligibility requirements will be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving financial assistance from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

5. **Appeals and Complaints**

Decisions may be appealed on the following grounds:

- where there has been an administrative or procedural error in the adjudication process; or
- where the decision is based on factual error.

*Procedural error* includes any departure from the Council's policy regarding undeclared conflict of interest or a failure to provide prescribed information to the adjudication committee. While the Council makes every effort in designated programs to secure external assessments from knowledgeable and objective reviewers, in some cases this is not possible. Under such circumstances, the committee is asked to give the application an in-depth review and the lack of external assessments does not constitute grounds for appeal.
Factual error exists where there is compelling evidence that the committee based its decision not to recommend an award on a conclusion which is contrary to information clearly stated in the application. An example of such an error would be a committee statement that an application was not recommended due to the applicant's lack of any peer-reviewed publications, where in fact, the application lists several publications in media universally acknowledged to be peer-reviewed. The Council will not accept appeals where the committee, though it could be in error in interpreting the proposal and any assessments, has made a reasonable attempt to judge fairly the merit of an application. Nor is the appeal process intended to deal with differences of scholarly opinion among applicants, adjudication committees and external assessors. Similarly, SSHRC does not permit appeals based on the composition of adjudication committees or on the amount awarded.

Notwithstanding its published policy on appeals, SSHRC routinely receives calls and letters complaining about decisions. If committee members are contacted by an applicant, whether before or following the adjudication, members must not engage in correspondence or dialogue with applicants, but rather should refer all calls or letters directly to SSHRC for a response. Committees are not responsible for dealing with queries or complaints; SSHRC staff will ensure that appropriate action is taken and that the reasons for SSHRC's decisions are carefully explained to applicants.

SSHRC's full appeals policy may be found on its Web site (www.sshrc.ca).
IV. Role and Functioning of Adjudication Committees

1. Organization of Standard Research Grant Adjudication Committees

There are 23 adjudication committees in the Standard Research Grants program. They cover the various social sciences and humanities disciplines as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classics, ancient and mediaeval studies, religious studies, classical archaeology</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History: history of science, technology and medicine</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine arts: history and philosophy of art, architecture, theatre, music, film, dance</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics, applied linguistics and translation</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology and demography</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography, urban planning and environmental studies</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology 1: Social, personality and individual differences; behavioural, community and environmental; cultural (For additional disciplines, see Committee 27)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 1: Arts education, bilingual education, second language education, civic and environmental education, curriculum, geography and history education, moral, values and religious education, reading and writing, science and math education, teacher education (For additional disciplines, see Committees 17 and 28)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary studies</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology and archaeology</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 2: Library and information science, archival science, adult, continuing and community education, comparative education, computer assisted instruction, distance education, educational administration, educational technology (media), higher education, history, philosophy and theory of education, sociology of education, vocational education (For additional disciplines, see Committees 12 and 28)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature 1: English (from the Mediaeval to the Victorian period), French, German, Slavic</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature 2: American, modern and contemporary literatures in English, English Canadian, First Nations, French Canadian &amp; Québec, romance, other languages &amp; literatures</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health studies and social work</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources management, international business, management; marketing, organizational studies, business policy, industrial relations</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, finance, management of information systems, management science, production and operations management</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, socio-legal studies and criminology</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applicants select one of these 23 committees to adjudicate their application on the basis of the subject of the research. Applicants selecting Committee 15 (interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary) must include with their application a covering letter that:

1. explains how their research will integrate intellectual resources (theories, methodologies, perspectives, etc.) from two or more disciplines;

2. identifies the various disciplines from which the external assessors who will assess the research proposal should be drawn (this information is taken into account by the program officer);

3. indicates which scholarly publications they will use to reach academics who are active in the disciplines relevant to their proposed program of research.

2. How Members are Chosen

Selection Process

SSHRC regularly solicits nominations to its adjudication committees from universities and professional associations. Former committee members and SSHRC staff may also nominate committee members.

Program officers propose the slate of nominees for each committee. The program director, the vice-president of the Programs Branch and the president of SSHRC then approve the nominations. Council uses the same procedure to select the chair, normally an individual who has already served on the adjudication committee.

Selection Criteria

The primary considerations in structuring adjudication committees are to ensure:

- the overall competence and credibility of the committee;
- the scholarly stature of the individual nominees;
- appropriate representation on the basis of areas of expertise, university, region, language and gender;
- appropriate knowledge of both official languages. (In order to participate in bilingual discussions without simultaneous translation, members must have a reading knowledge and good aural comprehension of the second official language.)
Term of Service

The Council normally limits committee members’ term of service to three years, with the possibility of a single year’s extension in order to act as committee chair. Renewal of the membership is essential to maintain the vitality of the adjudication committees. Rotation of membership allows for a broad representation of universities and complementary expertise. However, continuity is also desirable, since the presence of experienced members on the committees promotes consistency in the adjudication process and assists in the orientation of new members.

3. Responsibilities

Committee Members

General Responsibilities

As a committee member, you are responsible for evaluating the relative merits of each Standard Research Grant application submitted to you for review—except those which pose a conflict of interest—on the basis of the evaluation criteria specific to the program and the advice received from external assessors. You are also responsible for evaluating the requested budget of each proposal that you recommend for funding.

While program officers are responsible for choosing the external assessors, as a committee member you may wish to contribute to making this choice. Accordingly, when you receive the binders, you are welcome to suggest one or more external assessors.

Readers A and B

To facilitate committee discussion, two committee members (other than the chair) examine each application in detail. They are designated as Readers A and B.

As Reader A or B, you must:

- Ensure that you are not in a conflict of interest with the applicant (principal investigator) or with any co-applicants (co-investigators) or research collaborators of any application assigned to you.
- Prepare your comments on each application with a view to the discussion that will take place at the committee’s meeting in March, including a summary, on the Committee Comment and Scoring Sheet, of your observations about the records of research achievement and proposed programs of research according to the criteria set out in this manual. Where possible, relate your observations to the assessors’ comments, noting agreement or disagreement. Where your views do not concur with at least one of the assessors’, briefly explain in your notes why you do not endorse the assessors’ opinions. Your notes on the scoring sheets will serve as your speaking notes during committee discussions and to the extent that the committee endorses readers’ observations, their notes form the basis of the comments that the committee forwards to each applicant.
- Assign a preliminary score to each application assigned to you, based on one score for research achievements and one for program of research. Use Tables 1 and 2 in Part VII, Section 5 of this manual.
- Recommend an amount for the budget of each application assigned to you. In those cases where you assign a score of 3.0 or higher for both research achievement and program of research, you must propose, based on the budget you have recommended, an amount to be awarded for each year that is sufficient to allow the applicant to conduct the research successfully.
Committee Chair

The adjudication committee chair is responsible for ensuring that the committee carries out its work with fairness, thoroughness and integrity. The chair is also responsible for managing the committee's time efficiently so that each application can be discussed adequately.

The committee chair plays a vital role in ensuring that SSHRC's policies and procedures are observed, and that potential or actual conflict of interest situations involving committee members are avoided. The chair works closely with the program officer from whom he or she seeks guidance, as appropriate, before and during the adjudication process.

The committee chair:

• guides the committee's discussion of each application;
• ensures that the committee's final recommendations accurately reflect the consensus of its members;
• summarizes members' views and arguments in order to provide the applicant with a rationale for the committee's decision.

Program Officer

The program officer serves as both resource person to the committee and SSHRC's representative during the adjudication process. The officer is responsible for ensuring that, throughout the competition, all concerned understand fully and apply consistently all relevant SSHRC policies and regulations and treat each application equitably and fairly. The officer will intervene whenever necessary to guide and advise the committee and to help interpret SSHRC policy. The program officer also alerts the committee to any problems with specific applications or recommendations and suggests possible solutions.

Prior to the committee meeting, the program officer ensures that all applications to be considered meet SSHRC eligibility requirements. In addition to making the final selection of external assessors, the officer prepares a provisional rank-ordered list of applications based on the scores received from committee members in advance of the meeting.

During the committee meeting, the officer serves as secretary to the committee, recording the scores assigned to each application for research achievement and program of research, the comments that show the committee's consensus, and the budget recommendations.

After the committee meeting, the officer forwards to each applicant a written explanation of the committee's recommendation. The officer also responds to queries and complaints about competition results.

Council's Observers

Observers, appointed by Council and reporting to it and to SSHRC management, may be invited to attend the adjudication committee meetings. The observers act as liaison between the selection committees, SSHRC management and the Council and ensure that the committee follows SSHRC policies and selection criteria. Observers attend the committee meetings, but do not participate in the discussion of the applications.
4. Committee Expense Claims

SSHRC will cover the cost of your travel, accommodation and meals in accordance with Government of Canada Treasury Board guidelines. SSHRC will also reimburse you for long-distance telephone charges directly related to the adjudication.

The Council will send you a memo concerning travel arrangements. This will include a travel number which allows you to bill air or train tickets directly to SSHRC as well as information regarding reimbursement of travel expenses. You should be aware of the maximum allowances which federal regulations permit.

SSHRC strongly encourages committee members to take advantage of advance purchase excursion (APEX) and other reduced fares. SSHRC will reimburse any additional hotel and subsistence costs you may incur in order to qualify for the reduced fare, provided that the total amount of the fare plus the additional accommodation and subsistence costs are less than the cost of a full economy fare.
V. Overview of the Standard Research Grants Program

SSHRC offers Standard Research Grants to support on-going, high-quality, independent research programs proposed by established or new scholars and judged through a process of peer review.

1. Objectives

The broad purpose of the Standard Research Grants program is to support and foster excellence in social sciences and humanities research.

The specific objectives of the program are to:

- support high-quality independent programs of research, as proposed by scholars and judged by their peers;
- provide opportunities for the training of future researchers;
- contribute to the development or elaboration of new theoretical or methodological approaches to research;
- maintain and develop vigorous research activities in the various disciplines;
- foster and develop vigorous collaborative, multidisciplinary research among social sciences and humanities researchers;
- assist the communication of research results both within and beyond the academic community.

Standard Research Grants support Canada's most productive researchers by providing them with flexible funding over three years. SSHRC believes that a scholar's record of research achievement is the best indicator of productivity and capacity to advance knowledge. The Council also believes that research has a crucial pedagogical function in the training of the next generation of scholars. Accordingly, SSHRC has incorporated the training of future researchers into the program's overall objectives.

Council defines a program of research as a sustained research enterprise that includes one or more projects or other components, and which is shaped by broad objectives for the advancement of knowledge. It might be undertaken primarily by one investigator and encompassed within a single research career, or it could mobilize a team of researchers during a specific period. In pursuit of the overall objectives, researchers or research teams may advance, adopt and modify specific approaches and methods as the research proceeds and as they produce and report results.

2. Budget and Number of Applications

Standard Research Grants account for a significant proportion of SSHRC's program budget. In the 2005-06 competition, the Council received 2513 applications and awarded 1014 grants for a success rate of 40.4 per cent. In dollar terms, grants awarded for three-year programs of research amounted to 28.8 per cent of total funding requested, with an average grant value of $83,499.
VI. Eligibility of Applications

SSHRC staff establish the eligibility of applications at the beginning of the administrative process. Committees must treat all proposals submitted to them as eligible, including those transferred from other granting councils. The following sections present the key criteria for determining eligibility.

1. Proposals

The Standard Research Grants program supports research in the humanities and social sciences that focuses on the study of individuals, human society or culture and that is undertaken either within a traditional discipline or as an interdisciplinary venture. Proposals having objectives that do not fall within SSHRC’s mandate are ineligible.

SSHRC encourages interdisciplinary research, whether it involves disciplines within SSHRC’s mandate or certain areas of research that are outside of SSHRC’s mandate. In the latter case, the Council considers proposals eligible so long as they contribute significantly to achieving SSHRC’s mission.

Disciplinary committees can expect to receive applications which cross committee boundaries, but which applicants have chosen not to direct to the interdisciplinary committee. SSHRC places a high value on interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research, and urges its adjudication committees to give such applications careful and open-minded attention. Do not discriminate against interdisciplinary proposals because they do not fit neatly into exclusive disciplinary frameworks.

Requested Budget

A researcher may request up to $100,000 annually, with a maximum of $250,000 over three years. If the researcher is affiliated with an institution that receives a grant through the SSHRC Institutional Grants program, he or she must present a minimum budget of $7,000 for at least one of the three years. These amounts do not include requests for research time stipends (RTS).

Research Tools

A program of research may include the creation of a research tool. Adjudication committees may recommend support for research tools if they judge them to be a priority for advancing research in the field and if the research community will have ready access to them.

Eligible research tools include:

- bibliographies, indices, catalogues of either specialized collections or significant research collections with appropriate bibliographic description; thematic, enumerative, author or descriptive bibliographies;
- concordances and dictionaries;
- materials that facilitate access to archival holdings or collections such as repository guides, inventories of a group of manuscripts or of a body of archives, inventories of documentary materials, thematic guides to archival materials, records surveys and special indices;
- scholarly editions.
SSHRC does not fund the following activities:

- the cataloguing or description of original holdings of any federal agency;
- the conversion of bibliographic records into machine-readable formats;
- document conservation;
- records management;
- the arrangement of documents.

2. Applicants

Applicants for SSHRC’s research, strategic and communications grants must in all cases be affiliated with a Canadian postsecondary institution. The signature on the application form of the authorized representative of the sponsoring institution represents that institution’s confirmation that the applicant meets SSHRC’s eligibility requirements for applying for and holding a grant.

Applicants who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of Canada must be employed in teaching or research by the sponsoring institution for the entire duration of the award.

A principal investigator may not apply for or hold, at the same time, more than one Standard Research Grant. The principal investigator may, however, be a co-investigator in other programs of research or hold a Strategic Grant.

Applicants may not be employed as an assistant or associate for a research program directed by another researcher.

A PhD candidate may apply as principal investigator only if she or he will have met all requirements for the degree by April 1st of the year in which the grant is awarded. The Council will require confirmation that the applicant has met all requirements for the degree before grant funds can be released.

The categories of applicants are as follows:

Regular Scholars

SSHRC defines a regular scholar as one who has established a record of research achievement, or who has had the opportunity to establish such a record since the completion of his or her highest degree, thus warranting evaluation predominantly on the basis of that record.

New Scholars

SSHRC is committed to supporting and encouraging scholars who are beginning their research careers or who are returning to research after an interval devoted to family responsibilities. Such scholars may apply as new scholars (the term bears no relation to the age of the scholar in question). SSHRC staff determine whether an applicant is eligible as a new scholar on the basis of the criteria set out below. The adjudication committee may not change an applicant’s designation.

Applicants requesting consideration as a new scholar must demonstrate that they have not applied successfully, as principal investigator or project director, for a grant from any of the following SSHRC programs: Standard Research Grants, Major Collaborative Research Initiatives, or Strategic Grants.
In addition, they must have:

1. completed their highest degree no more than five years before the competition deadline (SSHRC considers only the date of completion of the first doctorate);
   or

2. held a tenured or tenure-track university appointment for less than five years;
   or

3. held a university appointment, but never a tenure-track position (in the case of institutions which offer tenure-track positions);
   or

4. had their careers significantly interrupted or delayed for family reasons.

Research Teams
SSHRC welcomes and encourages collaborative research. Research teams may include the following participants:

Principal investigator (Applicant): A scholar who has primary responsibility for the intellectual direction of the research and who assumes responsibility for administering the grant.

Co-investigator (Co-applicant): A scholar who makes a significant contribution to the intellectual direction of the research, who plays a significant role in the conduct of the research and who may also have some responsibility for financial aspects of the research.

Research collaborator: A scholar who may play various roles in the research activities, including participating in their intellectual direction. Collaborators need not be affiliated with a Canadian postsecondary institution and may be Canadian citizens or permanent residents or foreign citizens.
VII. Evaluation and Adjudication of Standard Research Grants

1. Adjudication Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application deadline</td>
<td>October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSHRC selects external assessors</td>
<td>Nov.–Dec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSHRC sends binders (with applications and designation of Readers A and B) to all committee members</td>
<td>mid-December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSHRC receives written external assessments</td>
<td>Dec.–early Feb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSHRC forwards assessments to committee members</td>
<td>Dec.–mid-Feb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee meetings in Ottawa</td>
<td>early March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement of results</td>
<td>mid–April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Adjudication Process

The steps in the adjudication process are as follows:

**Before the Committee Meeting**

**Program Officers:**
- determine eligibility of applications;
- assign external assessors to review applications;
- designate Readers A and B for applications;
- prepare a complete list of the applicant scores submitted by the committee members in anticipation of the adjudication meetings.

**Committee Members:**
- receive a set of binders containing copies of all applications submitted to the committee;
- identify any conflicts of interest that may exist between themselves and the applicants, co-applicants and research collaborators who have submitted applications to their committee (see Part III, section 2 for information about managing conflicts of interest);
- assign a score to each application to which they have been assigned as reader, using the criteria and scoring system outlined below (see Part VII, sections 4-6 for regulations on scoring applications);
- prepare comments on each application to which they have been assigned as reader in preparation for the committee’s discussion at the adjudication meeting;
- recommend a budget for each application to which they have been assigned as reader (see Part VIII below for information on this topic);
- forward to SSHRC, one week before the adjudication meeting, preliminary scores for research achievement and program of research for all the applications to which they have been assigned as reader;
• communicate with the program officer and, if necessary, the committee chair, and may participate in a teleconference to discuss application of the evaluation criteria and scoring system and to devise a strategy for managing committee time in Ottawa;
• forward their binders to SSHRC, by courier, a few days before the committee meeting.

Committee Chairs:
• participate in a one-day meeting in January (date to be confirmed);
• cooperate closely with the program officer to ensure the success of the adjudication.

During the Committee Meeting
• All the Standard Research Grants adjudication committees meet simultaneously over a one-week period at the beginning of March. Meetings are held in Ottawa and last from two to five days depending on the number of applications before the committee.

Committee members:
• discuss all the applications on the basis of their preliminary scores;
• decide, by consensus, on a final score for each application;
• rank all the applications;
• agree upon, for each application recommended for funding, a budget adequate for the proposed research;
• agree upon the comments that will be forwarded to each applicant (principal investigator).

For evaluation criteria, see Part VII, section 4 below.

At the end of the Committee Meeting
• The committee reviews the rank-ordered list of applications and finalizes their scores, rankings and budgets.
• The committee chair signs the spreadsheet. After this, it is no longer possible to change the ranking of any application. The final list divides the adjudicated applications into three categories: successful applications, applications recommended for funding, but for which funds are not available (lack of available resources does not permit support of all meritorious applications), and applications not recommended for funding.
• The committee discusses policy issues relevant to assessing the adjudication process. This is also the occasion to make suggestions for improving future adjudications.

After the committee meeting
• Council determines the number of applications that will receive grants based on their rank-order as established by the committee and on the total funding available.
• All applications that the committee recommends for funding are submitted to the president of SSHRC for his or her approval.
In order to justify SSHRC's decision, the program officer prepares, for each application, a written recommendation based on the committee's discussion, which Council will forward to the applicant together with those external assessments that were received in time for the adjudication meeting.

3. External Assessments

The first part of the adjudication process involves obtaining, for every application, independent assessments from Canadian and international specialists in the appropriate field(s). Given the number and breadth of proposals that SSHRC receives, adjudication committees depend on the advice of external experts since they do not always possess the range of expertise necessary to competently judge all applications.

Each application must receive not fewer than two and not more than three such assessments. One of the assessors is selected, where possible, from the applicant's list of suggested assessors; the program officer chooses the other(s). SSHRC staff aim to send all applications to the assessors before the beginning of January and to forward the external assessments to committee members at regular intervals, with most reaching the committees before the beginning of February.

During the adjudication meeting, committee members judge the quality of the external evaluations and weigh the opinions expressed in order to decide on the relative merit of the applications. Should the committee make a negative recommendation contrary to the favourable recommendations of one or more of the assessors, the committee must take particular care to provide a clear rationale for that recommendation in order to demonstrate that the decision took full account of the external evaluations.

On occasion, the committee receives an assessment which it judges to be biased, unfair, or personally hurtful to the applicant. In such a case, Council asks the committee to use the committee comments to inform the applicant that it does not endorse the views of the assessor in question. In extreme cases, the committee may recommend that a particular assessor not be consulted in future.

If an assessment is insulting, degrading or defamatory to an applicant, the program officer may choose not to show that assessment to the committee.

In the rare case in which no external assessment is available for an application, the committee must take special care to justify its recommendations (based solely on its members' assessments) as fully as possible.

4. Evaluation Criteria

It is essential that SSHRC be able to provide each applicant with a clear, reasonable and sufficient explanation for the adjudication committee's recommendation and Council's final decision. Where a recommendation differs from that of one or more of the external assessors, the committee's explanation for it should be particularly detailed. This is especially important in the case of applications which are unsuccessful, whether due to reasons of quality or due to SSHRC's limited budget. Committee comments also offer applicants encouragement as well as information and advice that can be extremely valuable in preparing future research proposals and in conducting research supported through SSHRC grants.
Applications for Standard Research Grants are evaluated on the basis of two criteria:

- the applicant’s and any co-applicants’ records of research achievement (track record);
- the proposed program of research.

**Record of Research Achievement**

The record of research achievement refers to any tangible contribution that an applicant has made to the advancement, development and dissemination of knowledge in his or her discipline or field.

Base your evaluation of the record of research achievement primarily on contributions to research the applicant has made within the last six years or, if the applicant's research career has been interrupted, his or her most recent period of research activity. In evaluating the record of regular scholars, also take into account the applicant's five most significant contributions, where indicated—these will help to accurately situate the most recent six years in the context of the applicant's overall career.

You should also evaluate each applicant’s record of research achievement and overall contribution to research in relation to, or measured against, the stage of the applicant's research career. To fairly judge the research record, you should also take into consideration any extenuating circumstances which the applicant has shown to have justifiably impeded the development of his or her research.

For the record of research achievement, there are two scoring schemes: one applies to new scholars, the other to regular scholars (see the two columns in Table 1 below).

Take into consideration any special circumstances or career interruptions that may have delayed or interrupted an applicant’s research career.

**Career interruptions** occur when, for health, administrative, family or other reasons, a researcher is taken away from his or her research work for an extended period of time. In these cases, the researcher should explain the absence(s) and ask that an equivalent period of research activity prior (but as near as possible) to the six-year mark be taken into consideration by the adjudication committee.

**Special circumstances** involve slow-downs in research productivity created by health, administrative, family or other reasons (i.e., the researcher was not taken completely away from his or her work).

In addition, take into account the type of organization with which the researcher is affiliated. A researcher affiliated with a small university that does not have a graduate program in his or her area of expertise will necessarily make rather different contributions to student training than a researcher from a large university that offers an extensive and well-established graduate program.

In the case of applications from research teams, evaluate the team’s overall record of achievement in light of each member’s role in the project, placing more weight on the achievements of those with more central roles. Refer to the section of the application entitled “Description of the Team” for information on the planned roles and responsibilities of team members. The principal investigator’s achievements should form an important component of your team evaluation, as this person is responsible for the planning and coordination of the entire research project.
Contributions to research may include:

- refereed publications, including books, chapters of books and articles;
- book reviews by the applicant/co-applicant or published reviews of his or her work;
- research reports, papers presented at scholarly meetings or conferences, and other forms of written scholarly expression or participation in public discourse and debate which constitute a contribution to research;
- where appropriate, contributions to the training of future researchers, including the supervision of graduate theses and/or the involvement of students in research activities;
- research results from previous research grants, other awards from SSHRC or other sources;
- academic awards and distinctions (especially in the case of those applying as new scholars).

The specific criteria for evaluating the record of research achievement include:

- quality and significance of published work (taking into consideration the quality of the chosen publication venues);
- originality of previous research and its impact on the discipline or field;
- quantity of research activity relative to the stage of the applicant’s career;
- demonstrated importance of other scholarly activities and contributions;
- recentness of output (taking into account the nature of the applicant’s career pattern and previous non-research responsibilities);
- importance and relevance of dissemination of research results to non-academic audiences (as appropriate);
- significance of any previous research supported by SSHRC or any other agency;
- where applicable, contribution to the training of future researchers. (The committee must make allowances for applicants who have not supervised graduate students simply because their university does not offer graduate programs.)
- efforts made, where appropriate, to develop research partnerships with civil society organizations and government departments.

**Proposed Program of Research**

Programs of research are shaped by broad objectives for the advancement of knowledge and may comprise one or more projects undertaken over a three-year period or longer. SSHRC does not, therefore, expect researchers to submit, in the limited space allowed, detailed descriptions of their research methods, as these may change during the course of the research.

Applicants should provide the following information:

- explicit objectives, situated within the context of current scholarly literature;
- relationship of the proposed research to the individual's ongoing research or to insights gained from earlier achievements;
- importance, originality and anticipated contribution of the proposed research;
- theoretical approach or framework;
• research strategies or methodologies;
• plans for the communication of research results within and beyond the academic community;
• specific roles and responsibilities of students and research assistants, including how their duties will complement their academic training;
• relationship of requested budget to proposed program of research.

The specific criteria for evaluating the proposed program of research are:

• degree of originality and nature of expected contribution to the advancement of knowledge;
• scholarly and intellectual as well as social and cultural significance of the research;
• appropriateness of the theoretical approach or framework;
• appropriateness and expected effectiveness of the research strategies or methodologies;
• feasibility of successfully completing the program of research and the appropriateness of the schedule of research, given the applicant's and/or research team's resources and commitments;
• suitability and expected effectiveness of plans to communicate research results both within and, as appropriate, beyond the academic community;
• nature and extent of research training, where appropriate.
• contribution to interdisciplinary research (for committee 15 only).

Training Opportunities and Dissemination Plans

In evaluating the record of research achievement and the proposed program of research, the committee must take into consideration, where appropriate, the training opportunities to be provided to students and the plans for disseminating research results. SSHRC considers research training and dissemination of results to be key priorities.

Therefore the committee should evaluate carefully and reflect in the application's final score the nature and extent of research training included in the proposed program of research, and how this training will complement students' academic training. You should similarly treat applicant's proposed dissemination plans.

Proposals for the Creation of Research Tools

Proposals for the creation of research tools are assessed according to the evaluation criteria specified for all Standard Research Grant applications, described above. Adjudication committees may recommend support for research tools to the extent that they are judged to be a priority for advancing research in the field and that they will be widely accessible to the research community.

5. Scoring System

Basic Principles

Overall efficiency and fairness to all applicants require that different readers—both within and across committees—eliminate as far as possible any variations in the standards of
evaluation they apply to applications. Readers should evaluate applicants’ records of research achievement using the two different marking schemes set out in Table 1—one for regular scholars and one for new scholars—and the proposed programs of research using the scoring system set out in Table 2. Assign scores out of 6—if necessary, to the first decimal place. This is the best way to ensure that you are applying the standards consistently to all applicants.

To be recommended for funding, an application must receive a minimum score of 3.0 on both the record of research achievement (track record) and the proposed program of research (see Tables 1 and 2 below). Applications marked below 3.0 on one element do not qualify for funding, regardless of how well they do on the other element. Whether for regular or new scholars, the two scores are automatically given the proper weighting when the committee’s scores are entered on the spreadsheet.

**Proposals from Regular Scholars**

In evaluating applications from regular scholars, greater weight is placed on the quality of their research achievements than on their program of research. Past research achievements are an essential indicator of productivity and capacity to advance knowledge. Accordingly, for regular scholars, we assign 60 per cent of the overall score to the record of research achievement and 40 per cent of the overall score to the program of research.

**Proposals from New Scholars**

For new scholars, we automatically weight the record of research achievement at 60 per cent and the program of research at 40 per cent, or vice versa—*whichever weighting will produce the highest overall score*. For example, if a new scholar receives a higher score on the program of research than on the record of research achievement, derive 60 per cent of the overall score from the former score and 40 per cent from the latter score.

**Proposals from Research Teams**

In the case of an application from a team of researchers, it is the category (new or regular scholar) of the principal investigator which determines the weighting applied in calculating the overall score. Evaluate the team’s record of research achievement in light of the roles played by each team member in the project, assigning greater weight to members with more central roles. The principal investigator’s record of achievement should form an important component of your evaluation of the team’s record, as this person is responsible for the planning and coordination of the program of research.

If the adjudication committee determines that the principal investigator is not responsible for, or equipped to exercise, the leadership of the research team, the committee may lower the score assigned for program of research.
Table 1: Record of Research Achievement

Apply the scores and descriptors presented in this table. Take into account the scholar’s stage of career and any special circumstances as appropriate. If your rationale for assigning a score to a particular application differs significantly from what is prescribed in the table, be prepared to briefly explain your reasons when reporting on that application at the committee meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Regular Scholar</th>
<th>New Scholar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0-6.0</td>
<td><strong>Excellent:</strong> Recognized nationally and perhaps internationally for the excellent quality and substantial impact of his or her publications within the discipline or beyond. The researcher has a distinguished publication record, and has published both consistently and recently. Where applicable, has had significant publications from previous funding; has made significant contribution to training of future researchers; and, where appropriate, has disseminated results beyond academia.</td>
<td><strong>Excellent:</strong> Recognized for the originality and quality of the research and publications within the discipline or beyond. Has demonstrated significant recent productivity. Where applicable, has made good contributions to training of future researchers; and, where appropriate, has disseminated results beyond academia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9</td>
<td><strong>Very good:</strong> Recognized for the quality and the impact of publications within the discipline or beyond. The researcher has published both consistently and recently. One or more of the following elements could have been better demonstrated: where applicable, publications from previous funding; good contribution to the training of future researchers; and, where appropriate, dissemination of results beyond academia.</td>
<td><strong>Very good:</strong> Research and publications are considered to be fairly original and of very good quality. Has demonstrated good recent productivity. One or both of the following elements could have been better demonstrated: where applicable, some contribution to training of future researchers; and, where appropriate, dissemination of results beyond academia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.9</td>
<td><strong>Good:</strong> Has made some impact within the discipline or beyond. Has published regularly and fairly recently. The committee may have concerns regarding one or more of the following elements: where applicable, publications from previous funding; contribution to the training of future researchers; and, where appropriate, dissemination of results beyond academia.</td>
<td><strong>Good:</strong> Has demonstrated competence to conduct research. Has made some progress toward establishing a track record. The committee may have concerns regarding one or both of the following elements: where applicable, contribution to training of future researchers; and, where appropriate, dissemination of results beyond academia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 3.0</td>
<td><strong>Modest:</strong> Does not appear to have made an impact within the discipline or beyond. Does not appear to have published regularly or recently. Fails to demonstrate experience in one or more of the following areas: where applicable, publications from previous funding; contributions to the training of future researchers; and, where appropriate, dissemination of results beyond academia.</td>
<td><strong>Modest:</strong> Has not yet demonstrated the capacity to successfully carry out the research proposed. Has yet to make demonstrable progress towards establishing a track record. Fails to demonstrate experience in one or more of the following areas: where applicable, contribution to training of future researchers; and, where appropriate, dissemination of results beyond academia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distribution of Scores

![Distribution of Scores](chart)
Table 2: Program of Research

This scale applies to both new and regular scholars. If the nature of the research proposed (e.g., creation of a research tool) is such that a theoretical framework or any other component mentioned in this table is not necessary, this component should not be taken into account in the evaluation of the program of research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Characteristics of the program of research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0-6.0</td>
<td><strong>Strongly recommended for funding</strong>: highly original, at the forefront of the field. The theoretical/conceptual approach or framework is focused, fully explained and well-developed; the literature review is reasonably complete, up-to-date and linked to the program of research; the methodology is well-described and will lead to meaningful results. The training, where applicable, and dissemination components are very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.9</td>
<td><strong>Recommend for funding</strong>: original, meets quality standards and will contribute to the development of the field. One or more of the following elements should have been better developed: literature review, theoretical/conceptual framework and/or methodology. The training, where applicable, and dissemination components are good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.9</td>
<td><strong>Fund if funds are available</strong>: a good research proposal but lacks at least one compelling element. The committee has concerns regarding one or more of the following elements: originality/novelty, literature review, theoretical/conceptual framework, and/or methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 3.0</td>
<td><strong>Not recommended for funding</strong>: Low probability of significant contribution to the field. Serious shortcomings in one or more of these following elements: originality/novelty, literature review, theoretical/conceptual framework, and/or methodology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Distribution of Scores Diagram](image-url)
VIII. Reviewing Budget Proposals and Determining Award Size

1. Committee Envelopes and Funding

During the adjudication meetings, the committees determine which proposals merit funding support and recommend a budget for each.

After the meetings, SSHRC staff calculate the final allocation of funds (envelope) for each committee on the basis of the total funds available for the Standard Research Grants program and the total funding recommended by all the committees. SSHRC staff apply the envelope available to a committee to the rank-ordered list which that committee has provided. Beginning at the top of the list and moving down, applicants receive the full amount the committee has recommended until funds run out. As the SSHRC matching portion of any Research Time Stipend is allocated from a fixed funding envelope in descending order of merit, not all awards will include such stipends where they have been requested. Individual committee envelopes may be adjusted slightly so that applicants falling on the funding cut-off line still receive the full recommended budget.

This allocation process is sensitive to changes and growth in disciplinary funding requirements. It allocates funds among committees on the basis of excellence rather than according to the number of applications or the historical size of awards in each committee.

2. Duration of Award

SSHRC offers Standard Research Grants for three-year programs of research. Thus, applications and awards will normally be for three years. Normally, successful applicants may submit only one application as a principal investigator within any three-year period. Applicants may apply for only one or two years of support; however, they must explain in their application why a shorter research period is appropriate. Under exceptional circumstances, if the applicant believes there are substantive scholarly reasons for re-applying within the three-year cycle, he or she may do so and SSHRC will make an eligibility ruling in consultation with the adjudication committee.

Only in exceptional circumstances should a committee recommend funding for a shorter period than that requested by the applicant.

3. Budget Review and Size of Award

For each application that has received a score of 3.0 or higher for both research achievement and program of research, the committee determines the level of funding that will be sufficient for the applicant(s) to carry out the approved program of research.

You should base the recommended grant value on the following criteria:

- the budget requested (which must bear clear and reasonable relation to the applicant's program of research);
- the justification provided;
- the normal standards and requirements of the relevant discipline(s) or field; and,
- the advice of the external assessors (if provided).

Please note that the budget appropriate for a team research program is likely to be somewhat larger than that required for an individual research program.
In addition, it is important to take into account the type of institution with which an applicant is affiliated: a researcher working at an isolated institution will tend to assign a larger part of his or her budget to travel and communications expenses than a researcher located in a major centre.

The primary task of the adjudication committee in this respect is to establish an appropriate overall level of funding for the program of research rather than to examine in minute detail each element of the proposed budget.

Please recommend award amounts rounded off to the nearest $1,000. Bear in mind that, for any given year, you may not recommend an amount greater than the applicant requested. Since grant holders are free to allocate their funds as they see fit in the pursuit of their program objectives, committees should therefore avoid a detailed examination of each line item.

**Eligible Expenses**

Applicants must justify all proposed budget expenditures. The *SSHRC Grant Holder’s Guide* (see under “Using Your Funds” on the SSHRC Web site) outlines eligible costs. In reviewing an applicant's proposed budget, bear the following in mind:

**Student Salaries and Stipends:** Given the importance SSHRC attaches to the training of future researchers, exercise caution in reducing funds requested for student participation.

When students are paid by salary, the amounts should be determined in accordance with the university's collective agreement or policy. No SSHRC maximums apply when paying students by salary.

Researchers may request a stipend for graduate students and postdoctoral fellows. Stipends must be justified in accordance with the objectives of the research program, and the work performed by recipients of the stipend should be an integral part of the applicant's program of research. When students are paid by stipend, the following maximum amounts per annum must be respected: for full-time master's students, $12,000; for full-time doctoral students, $15,000; for full-time postdoctoral fellows, $31,500.

Students and scholars who hold a SSHRC or CGS master's or doctoral award or a SSHRC postdoctoral fellowship may not receive stipends from grants, although they may continue to work as research or teaching assistants for an hourly wage.

**Equipment:** SSHRC policy is that the cost of durable equipment such as computers may form part of the grant budget when—and only when—essential to the program of research. However, researchers cannot use SSHRC funds to help defray the costs of university overhead.

**Travel and Subsistence Costs:** These are eligible only if data or other sources of information essential to the research are not available in the applicant's immediate vicinity or if required for the communication of research results.

The travel and subsistence costs of research collaborators, both Canadian and foreign, may be included in the budget only if the purpose of such visits is for research planning, exchange of information or the dissemination of research results, but cannot cover more than 125 days per person per annum. (SSHRC accepts per diem rates as established by the applicant's university).

**International Collaboration:** SSHRC encourages Canadian researchers to develop international research collaboration. To this end, applicants may include in their budget the travel and subsistence costs of foreign research collaborators that conform to the
requirements set out in the previous paragraph. Furthermore, when a program of research involves research abroad, foreign research assistants may be hired, if necessary. **Dissemination:** Researchers may allot whatever portion of their budget they deem reasonable to disseminate research results as widely as possible. Eligible items include the circulation of findings, travel to scholarly conferences or other meetings to report on the research, translation, and the cost of holding a workshop directly related to the research funded. Researchers may also charge to the grant the cost of preparing a manuscript for publication, including the preparation and/or purchase of illustrations.

**Research Time Stipend (RTS)**

SSHRC recognizes the need for grant holders to have sufficient time to conduct research and views itself and the grant holder’s institution of employment as jointly responsible for a grant holder’s release from teaching. SSHRC will therefore fund up to 50 per cent of the actual cost of release time for applicants who can secure one-to-one matched funding from their university. Applicants may request a research time stipend of up to $15,000 for each eligible team member over the three years of the grant.

SSHRC requests that committees do not deliberate upon the merit or justification of stipend requests.

Subject to availability of funds for this purpose, where applications are ranked high enough to receive an award, the Council will include requested Research Time Stipends in the awards.

**Multiple-Source Funding**

SSHRC encourages jointly funded activities and will complement but not duplicate funds another organization or agency has awarded. Principal investigators and co-investigators must therefore list the research funds they have requested from other granting bodies. The availability or anticipation of funding from another source is not an evaluation criterion, nor is such funding grounds for reducing an applicant’s budget request to SSHRC. SSHRC program and monitoring officers are responsible for verifying any duplication of funding.

**Ineligible Expenses**

The following expenses are ineligible (the list is not exhaustive):

1. Research by the applicant or co-applicant leading to a degree.
2. Education-related costs, such as thesis defence, publication, tuition and course fees, etc.
3. Research costs of Strategic Grant partners.
4. Research costs of research collaborators (except travel and subsistence costs incurred in order to meet with member of the research team).
5. Any research expenses related to work being carried out by the researcher under contract to a public or private agency or firm for their own purposes, with the exception of work commissioned by a non-government publisher.
6. Activities that have no significant research component (e.g., conducting a public opinion poll which does not include analysis likely to produce new knowledge, reviewing literature, preparing research proposals, summarizing the findings of other researchers, etc.). This does not apply to Research Development grants.
7. Fees for consultation with colleagues or for their participation in the research.
8. Contingency allowances.
9. Indirect costs (e.g., medical insurance) or administrative overhead.
10. Purchase or rental of standard office equipment such as desks, chairs, filing
cabinets, photocopiers, facsimile machines and answering machines. (Note: certain
equipment costs are eligible expenses.)
11. Sales taxes to which an exemption or rebate applies.
12. Childcare expenses.
13. The cost of memberships in professional associations.
14. Professional training or development, including computer and language training.
15. Preparation of teaching materials.
16. Curriculum development (e.g., preparing course material or syllabus designed for a
program of teaching—unless it is of demonstrated theoretical importance or part of a
research program or project).
17. Simple collection or assembling of information (rather than analysis designed to
answer a research question or test an hypothesis).
18. Entertainment costs.
19. Hospitality costs.
20. The purchase of land.
21. Discretionary severance and separation packages.
22. General departmental expenses. Although researchers may use grant funds to
share common research expenses, the cost of the shared expenses must be
pro-rated on the basis of benefit obtained. The grant funds may not be used to
contribute to shared expenses for which the researcher will obtain no benefit.
23. Administrative (or management) charges and fees
25. Standard monthly connection or rental costs of telephones.
26. Connection or installation of lines (telephones or other links).
27. Voice mail, cellular phone rental or purchase.
28. Library acquisitions, computer and other information services provided to all
members of an institution.
29. Any part of the salary, or consulting fee, of an individual whose status would make
them eligible to apply for a grant.
30. Subsistence costs for more than 125 days per person per year.
31. During sabbatical and leave periods:
   - Transportation costs of research personnel to and from your sabbatical or
     leave location for supervisory or academic purposes.
   - Transportation costs to the home institution for supervisory purposes during
     sabbatical leave.
   - Living expenses during sabbatical leave.