PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT GRANTS (PDG)

RICK LINDEN
Partnership Development Grants: Key Features

- **Applicant**: Principal investigator/project director
- **Duration**: 1 to 3 years
- **Value**: $75,000 to $200,000
- **Institutional and partner contributions**: Secure cash and/or in-kind contributions during life of grant. While there is no minimum contribution, applicant and partners are expected to demonstrate a formal partnership exists or will be developed.
- **Application process**: One-stage application
Success Rate 2013-14

- 57 out of 154 funded - 37%
- Most were for the full $200,000 over 3 years
- Success 41% for social sciences, 25% for humanities and 12% for interdisciplinary

Personal Comments
- SSHRC has made the assessment process more systematic than in the CURA and Clusters programs
- So outcomes are fairer (in part because there are more funds available).
PDG: Key Features
Purpose

— Develop research and related activities—including knowledge mobilization and the meaningful involvement of students and new scholars—by fostering new research partnership activities involving existing and/or potential partners; or

— Design and test new partnership approaches for research and/or related activities that may result in best practices or models that either can be adapted by others or have potential to be scaled up at a regional, national or international level.

Note: The PDG funding opportunity seeks to support both new and existing formal partnerships.
2012 Adjudication Committee Composition

- Two multidisciplinary and multisectoral committees comprised of 22 members (12 women, 10 men) including the chairs.
- Sixteen members affiliated with postsecondary institutions covering a wide range of research areas and disciplines (e.g., Business, Education, Aboriginal Research, Environment, History, Digital Economy, Fine Arts, Regional Development, Psychology, Sociology, Women’s Studies, etc.)
- Six members affiliated with the private, public and non-profit sectors (i.e., Canadian War Museum, Portfolio IV Media and Consulting, Plug-In Institute of Contemporary Arts, Digital Opportunity Trust, Avataq Cultural Institute, Roslyn Kunin and Associates, Inc.)
CHALLENGE — *The aim and importance of the endeavour (50%):*

- originality, significance and expected contribution to knowledge;
- appropriateness of the literature review;
- appropriateness of the theoretical approach or framework;
- appropriateness of the methods/approach (including the co-creation of knowledge);
- quality of training and mentoring to be provided to students, emerging scholars and other highly qualified personnel, and opportunities for them to contribute;
- potential influence and impact within and/or beyond the social sciences and humanities research community; and
- potential for long-term viability and progress indicators.
FEASIBILITY — *The plan to achieve excellence (20%)*:

- probability of effective and timely attainment of the proposal’s objectives;
- quality and genuineness of the formal partnership and associated management and governance arrangements and leadership, including involvement of partners and others in the design and conduct of the research and/or related activities;
- appropriateness of the requested budget and justification of proposed costs;
- indications of other planned resources (time, human and financial), including leveraging of cash and in-kind support from the host institution and/or from partners;
- quality of the knowledge mobilization plans, including effective dissemination, exchange and plans to engage within and/or beyond the research community; and
- strategies and timelines for the design and conduct of the activity/activities proposed.
CAPABILITY — *The expertise to succeed (30%)*:

- quality, quantity and significance of past experience and published outputs of the applicant and/or team members relative to their role in the partnership and to the stage of their career;
- evidence of contributions such as commissioned reports, professional practice, public discourse, public policies, products and services, development of talent, experience in collaboration, etc.;
- experience in formal partnerships; and
- potential to make future contributions.
Scoring Table

Adjudication committee members assign a score based on the following scoring table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4.9</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.9</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 3</td>
<td>Not recommended for funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To be recommended for funding, an application must receive a minimum score of 3.0 for each of the three criteria.
Decision Factors

- Need a research component.
  - One project wanted to put together an online information resource. This was very strong, but there was no sign of any actual research using this information.
  - Another was a nice project that intended to build a museum in an area where extensive anthropological research had been done. Great team, great project but no research (“SSHRC isn’t in the museum building business”)

- Partnership
  - Need to outline all details and specify governance.
  - Does the team make sense? Complementary strengths, experience working together.
  - Some experience with networks.
Decision Factors

- **C.V.**
  - Not as rigid as Insight grants program but need to show some strength in getting stuff out. Don’t apply as PI if you have no track record.
  - Make sure your c.v. is legible. Some made it impossible to sort out published from accepted and submitted, refereed from non-refereed, book reviews lumped with chapters. Not fun to sort out in the midst of 2 weeks+ of nonstop file reading and causes one to wonder how they will deal with $200k if they can’t even sort out their own articles.

- Objectives – make objectives explicit. Several used buzzwords such as ‘building capacity’ but no indication of what they would actually do or what impact the work would have.

- Budget should be clear – show where funds are coming from, which funding is confirmed, how it will be spent, etc. The reviewers are not auditors so make it easy. If you have ‘odd’ items (GIS specialist) make sure you specify what they will do and why they are necessary.
Decision Factors

- **Methodology**
  - Make it clear. Committees do not like ‘trust me’ methodology. You are competing against people who provide a meticulous description of methods so you need to do it as well. Some people proposed to do interviews but did not specify how many, or who would be interviewed.

- **Knowledge Mobilization** – be creative but at minimum set it out clearly and have a thorough plan.

- Don’t promise too much – one project asked for 2 years instead of 3 and had a research agenda that would have been impossible to complete in either 2 or 3. The PI had no demonstrated experience with the methodologies proposed, so it was clear he didn’t know what he was proposing to do.
LOGIC MODELS

Your planned work

Your intended results