

## Outline & Key Message

- Introductions
- Eligibility
  - New direction. Key message: Your CV is not strong enough in this *question* to make *this application* competitive at the Insight competition. What new skill, perspective, literature, language, &/or community will you learn?
- Elevator Pitch
  - Three sentences to sell the challenge, the feasibility and the impact.
- Audience / Evaluation
  - Non-specialist peers, depend heavily on the [scoring matrix](#) and subcategories of the [merit criteria](#). No external reviewers. Multidisciplinary committee is possible.
- Timeline
  - Single page, any format. Consider subtle use of colour for eye-friendliness.
- CCV
  - Past 6 years of scholarly productivity (publications) plus talent development (students nurtured), impact outside of academia, ability to transform research funds into scholarly and societal outputs.
- Q&A / Reading Group
  - A group of reading partners is strongly recommended. Even better if they are not in your discipline.

## Resources:

1. [Sample timelines](#).
2. [Budget \(2022-2023\)](#).
3. Sample Requests for [MutiDisciplinary Review](#).
4. [IDG Boot Camp Manual](#) In ERA. You need your CCID to download.
5. Recent examples of IDGs by Established Scholars (more in the [Successful Grants Library](#)):
  - a. *Exercise-related Cognitive Errors and Believability of Exercise Information* (Tanya Berry, 2020). [Link](#).
  - b. *When did You Drop Out? Identifying Barriers to Undergraduate Success* (Carrie Denmams Epp, 2021). [DOI](#).
  - c. *Cannabis in the closet?* (Sherry Dahlke 2019). [Link](#).
  - d. *Mapping Marginality: Landscape as Biography in Central Achaia Phthiotis, Greece* (Margriet Haaagsma, 2019). [Link](#).
  - e. *Instigating Change while Maintaining the Group: Identity Continuity and Social Change* (David Rast, 2019). [Link](#).
  - f. *From 'Monster' to Mentor: Developing PhD Supervision Competencies* (Victoria Ruetalo, 2020). [Link](#).
6. [Toolkit for Grants Success](#) holds many more tip sheets, workshop resources, sponsor documents, etc.

Pay attention to the sub-criteria!

- ✓ for established scholars: the proposal's fit as a new direction
- ✓ originality, significance & expected contribution to knowledge
- ✓ appropriateness of the literature review
- ✓ appropriateness of the theoretical approach or framework
- ✓ appropriateness of the methods/approach
- ✓ quality of training & mentoring to be provided to students, emerging scholars & other HQP; opportunities for them to contribute
- ✓ potential for the project results to have influence and impact within &/or beyond the humanities & social sciences research communities

- ✓ appropriateness of the proposed timeline and probability that the objectives will be met
- ✓ expertise of the applicant or team in relation to the proposed research
- ✓ appropriateness of the requested budget, justification of proposed costs, &, where applicable, other financial &/or [in-kind contributions](#)
- ✓ quality & appropriateness of [knowledge mobilization](#) plans, including for effective dissemination, exchange and engagement with stakeholders within &/or beyond the research community, where applicable.

- ✓ quality, quantity & significance of past experience & published &/or creative outputs of the applicant & any co-applicants, relative to their roles in the project & to the stage of their career;
- ✓ evidence of past knowledge mobilization activities (e.g., films, performances, commissioned reports, knowledge syntheses, experience in collaboration / other interactions with stakeholders, contributions to public debate & media), & of impacts on professional practice, social services & policies, etc.
- ✓ quality & quantity of past contributions to the development of [effective research training](#) & mentoring of students, postdoctoral researchers & other HQPs.

**Peer Adjudication:** 3 readers' scores averaged. All participate in a calibration exercise to ensure comparable scoring expectations:

[illegible]

## IDG Scoring Matrix: (lower numbers = higher rank)

Note:

“1 element could have been better” = *Very Good*. “2 elements could have been better” = *Good*. Sub category scores of ‘good’ or lower = not good enough to be funded.

Criteria	Unsatisfactory (6.0 - 5.17)	Moderate (5.16 - 4.34)	Satisfactory (4.33 - 3.51)	Good (3.5 - 2.68)	Very Good (2.67 - 1.84)	Excellent (1.83 - 1.0)
Challenge (50%)	Proposal has no probability of significant contribution to the field. There are serious shortcomings in one or more critical elements.	Proposal has low probability of significant contribution to the field. A weak research proposal that lacks more than one compelling element.	Proposal may contribute to the development of the field. An average research proposal that lacks one compelling element.	Proposal is somewhat original and may contribute to the development of the field. At least two elements could have been better described/developed.	Proposal is original, innovative and will contribute to the development of the field. One element could have been better described/developed.	Proposal is extremely original, innovative and at the forefront of the field. All elements are appropriate, clearly defined and up-to-date.
Feasibility (20%)	Objectives are unclear and there is a low probability of achieving success. There are serious shortcomings in one or more critical elements.	Objectives are identified but there is a low probability that they will be met. Concerns exist regarding at least two elements.	Objectives are identified but the committee has doubts that they will be met. Concerns exist regarding one element.	Objectives are defined and it appears likely that they will be met. At least two elements could have been better defined/developed.	Objectives are clearly defined and it is highly likely that they will be met. One element could have been better described/developed.	Objectives are explicit and clearly defined, and there is confidence that they will be met. All elements are appropriate, well justified, coherent and realistic.
Capability (30%)	Poor quality of published and/or creative outputs and/or rate of publication. Past contributions appear to have had little impact within or beyond the field. Little to no evidence of knowledge mobilization activities, development of talent and experience in collaboration. Potential to make future contributions is doubtful.	Low quality of published and/or creative outputs and/or rate of publication. Past contributions appear to have had low impact within the field or beyond the field. Lack of evidence of knowledge mobilization activities or development of talent and experience in collaboration. Potential to make future contributions appears to be low.	Fair quality of published and/or creative outputs and/or rate of publication. Past contributions have had some impact within the field. Some evidence of knowledge mobilization activities, development of talent and experience in collaboration. Potential to make future contributions appears to be fair.	Good quality of published and/or creative outputs and rate of publication. Past contributions have had some impact within and possibly beyond the field. Evidence of knowledge mobilization activities, development of talent and experience in collaboration. Potential to make future contributions is good.	Very good quality of published and/or creative outputs and rate of publication. Past contributions have had a considerable impact within and possibly beyond the field. Ample evidence of knowledge mobilization activities, development of talent and experience in collaboration. Potential to make future contributions is high.	Excellent quality of published and/or creative outputs and rate of publication. Past contributions have had a significant impact within and beyond the field. Abundant evidence of knowledge mobilization activities, development of talent and experience in collaboration. Potential to make future contributions is excellent.

Workshop Zoom recording from Nov 2, 2022 (last half of a session): Passcode: 2JE%4\$Da

[https://ualberta-ca.zoom.us/rec/share/ZCDyDCL\\_7yIhIJZXSXsUb6KGhTSGm2TxBGiXqCULA87oejeH9F-5FVGzY8tXkVb1.SfVvYNBusj6jOwGN](https://ualberta-ca.zoom.us/rec/share/ZCDyDCL_7yIhIJZXSXsUb6KGhTSGm2TxBGiXqCULA87oejeH9F-5FVGzY8tXkVb1.SfVvYNBusj6jOwGN)

### Follow up:

[Research Whisperer Hour](#) with Heather Young-Leslie, is usually in the morning, but not always on the same day of the week. So check back regularly!

Your Research Partner, Humanities & Social Sciences specialist, key contact for CSSH faculties, and anyone applying to SSHRC or Canada Council for the Arts. Is [Craig Taylor](#). Craig’s office is in Education, 842. Phone: X2-8059; He’s mostly on campus Tues - Thurs.

**Established Scholars' IDG reading & support group:** participants in today's session expressed interest in helping each other out by reading and giving peer-feedback on drafts of the IDG application. If you are interested in joining, please list your name below, and indicate if your strengths include reviewing academic French or English, and put an X in the cells for the disciplinary genres you would be willing to read. This sheet should help you self-organize around who will read for whom [please recognize that to be a good colleague, you will likely need to read outside of your own discipline].

[illegible]