RESEARCH ADVISORY COUNCIL

RESEARCH ADVISORY COUNCIL AGENDA

Mar. 20, 2025 | 1:30 pm – 3:30 pm | Teams

Present: Noah Schwartz, Garry, Fehr, Wade Deisman, Keith Carlson, Rita Dhungel, Janelle Scztuhar, Victoria Surtees, Alyson Jule, Irwin Cohen, Cynthia Thomson, Shawn Geniole, Michael Hitch, Amanda Wurz, Trevor Beugeling, Kelly Tracey, Brianna Strumm, Kathleen Rodgers, Chris Schinckus, Christine Elsey, Ismail El Sayad

Recorder: Jasleen Rakkar

Regrets: Paul Fontaine, Albert Kim, Mariano Mapili, Sandra Gillespie, Luisa Giles, Opeyemi Adesina, Masud Khawaja, Rita Dhungel, Barnabe Assogba, Gillian Hatfield, Lenore Newman, Satwinder Bains, Martha Dow, Jon Thomas, Shelley Canning, Anastasia Anderson, Jacob Spooner, Cindy Jardine, Lauren Erland, Tetsuomi Anzai, Lara Duke, Lin Long

Welcome and Introductions

1. **Items for Adoption**

Agenda: Mar. 20, 2025

1:35 **1.1** MOTION: THAT the agenda for the March 20, 2025, RAC meeting be approved as presented.
Cynthia Thomson, Irwin Cohen — CARRIED

Minutes: Feb. 06, 2025

1:38 **1.2** MOTION: THAT the minutes from the Feb. 06, 2025 RAC meeting be approved as presented.
Shawn Geniole, Cynthia Thomson — CARRIED

2. **Business**

1:40 **2.1**

3. **Discussion**

1:40 **3.1 Tri-agency grant writing recommendations from successful applicants**

- SSHRC Insight Development – Kathleen Rodgers
  - Kathleen provided an overview and insight into the grant writing process and review
- NSERC Discovery – Olav Lian
  - Olav provided a presentation on key components of successful NSERC applications. See presentation slides attached.

4. **Reports**

2:45 **4.1 Research Office report – see attached**

2:50 **4.2 Human Research Ethics Board report – see attached**

4.3 Teaching and Learning Advisory Council report – Victora Surtees

3:00 **4.4 Senate Research Committee report – see attached**

5. **Roundtable Discussion (time permitting)**
6. **Information Items**

2:40 **6.1**

- **Student Research Day – Garry Fehr**
  - Looking for faculty volunteer judges between 10am-1pm. Sign up online, here https://www.ufv.ca/research/students/student-research-day/faculty-judge-sign-up-form/

6.2

- **Submit nominations for URE - Garry Fehr**
  - Nomination deadline April 18th 2025

6.3

- **Undergraduate Student Research Awards – Garry Fehr**
- Decisions will be shared with applicants and their faculty supervisors in the first week of April via email

7. Adjournment:

7.1 Next meeting: May 15, 2025, 1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

Please see the Research Office website for more information on events and funding opportunities.

Applying for an NSERC Discovery Grant

NSERC has several grants available. The ones that I have landed are:

- Discovery Grants (individual)
- Research Tools & Instruments Grants (individual or a team)
- Alliance International Grant (a team)

What is my project (program) about?

- My research program has been about understanding how the landscape has changed as a result of major shifts in climate (NSERC supports research programs, not projects)

- My research involves sedimentology, stratigraphy, geomorphology, palaeoecology, and geochronology (specifically luminescence dating)

- I have been doing this for nearly 40 years, the last 20 years being at UFV

What is the grant writing process like?

Even if you have all your 'ducks in a row', it can be stressful. NSERC instructions are vague, so one really needs to learn from colleagues that have had good success in the past, especially those working at research universities.

What did you need to have ready to apply ?

Your Canadian Common CV needs to be completed when you submit your Notice of Intent (NOI) to Apply in August. You will need:

- List of publications (good quality peer-reviewed ones important)
- List of presentations
- List of students/colleagues (HQP) trained at all levels (BSc, MSc, PhD, postdocs, research associates)
- List of service to the institution and tp the academic community
- List of awards, patents, etc.
- And more

- Knowledge of how to embed EDI principles throughout

Did you apply as part of a team or with a co-investigator?

NSERC Discovery Grants are applied for individually, but the application asks that you to explain your collaborations

Research Tools & Instruments Grants can be applied for individually, but the greatest success is if you apply as a team. The team can consist of colleagues within or outside UFV.

It is helpful that the team is gender-diverse and includes some ‘stars’.

Alliance International grants are team grants by definition (needs an international partner)

Were graduate students involved in the research? If so, how did you find graduate students or post docs

Yes, graduate student and postdocs have been continuously involved in my research and are important to landing an NSERC grant, except at the New Investigator stage where less involvement is expected

The best way to attain graduate students at an institution like UFV is to become an adjunct professor at a research university and co-supervise them there. Several of my UFV undergraduate research students have been placed at UBC, SFU, or UNBC.

Once one's research program becomes nationally (or international) recognized, potential postdocs become interested in working with you. Or you find a large amount of external funds, and advertise from them (can be difficult in natural sciences)

How do we create successful applications within the context of our institution (teaching focused university)?

- If it is lab-based science research, then NSERC has to be convinced that facilities exist to accommodate it. Sharing of lab space in the larger research universities could be a solution if none can be found at UFV.
- Make it clear in the application that you are collaborating with colleagues at other universities, nationally and internationally. Some of these colleagues should be accomplished.
- Make it clear in your application the importance of student (HQP) training, and the skills they will acquire. Do this on a per student basis. Previous HQP training not that important for early career people.
- Mind the Discover Grants Merit Indicators (quality rather than quantity)
- Complete your application many weeks early so you can have NSERC-successful colleagues read it and provide advice

DISCOVERY GRANTS MERIT INDICATORS

The Merit Indicators should be used in conjunction with the Peer Review Manual, which outlines how reviewers arrive at a rating.

		EXCEPTIONAL	OUTSTANDING	VERY STRONG	STRONG	MODERATE	INSUFFICIENT
Excellence of the Researcher		Acknowledged as a **leader** in terms of research excellence, accomplishments, and service.	Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are **far superior** to others.	Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are **superior** to others.	Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are **significant**.	Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are **reasonable**.	Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are **below an acceptable level**.
		Contributions presented in the application are of the **highest level of quality**.	Contributions presented in the application are of **high quality**.	Contributions presented in the application are **above average in quality**.	Contributions presented in the application are of **good** quality.	Contributions presented in the application are of **reasonable** quality.	Contributions presented in the application are **limited** in quality.
		Impact and importance of the work is **clearly evident** and **groundbreaking**.	Impact and importance of the work is **clearly evident** and **influential**.	Impact and importance of the work is **clearly evident**.	Impact and importance of the work is **evident**.	Impact and importance of the work is **somewhat evident**.	Impact and importance of the work is **not clearly evident**.
Merit of the Proposal		Proposed research program is clearly presented, is **extremely original** and **innovative** and is **likely to have impact** by **leading to groundbreaking advances** in the area and/or **leading to a technology or policy** that addresses socio-economic or environmental needs.	Proposed research program is clearly presented, is **highly original** and **innovative** and is **likely to have impact** by **contributing to groundbreaking advances** in the area, and/or **leading to a technology or policy** that addresses socio-economic or environmental needs.	Proposed research program is clearly presented, is **original** and **innovative** and **is likely to have impact** by **leading to advancements** and/or addressing socio-economic or environmental needs.	Proposed research program is clearly presented, is **original** and **innovative** and is **likely to have impact** and/or address socio-economic or environmental needs.	Proposed research program is clearly presented, has **original** and **innovative aspects** and **may have impact** and/or address socio-economic or environmental needs.	Proposed research program, as presented **lacks clarity**, and/or is of **limited originality** and **innovation**.
		Long-term vision and **short-term objectives** are **clearly defined**.	**Long-term goals** are **clearly defined** and **short-term objectives** are **well planned**.	**Long-term goals** are **defined** and **short-term objectives** are **planned**.	**Long-term goals** and **short-term objectives** are **clearly described**.	**Long-term** and **short-term objectives** are **described**.	**Objectives** are **not clearly described** and/or likely not attainable.
		The methodology is **clearly defined** and **appropriate**.	The methodology is **clearly described** and **appropriate**.		The methodology is **described** and **appropriate**.	The methodology is **partially described** and/or **appropriate**.	The methodology is **not clearly described** and/or **appropriate**.
		The application **clearly demonstrates** how the research activities to be supported are distinct from those funded (or applied for) by other sources.					The application **does not clearly demonstrate** how the research activities to be supported are distinct from those funded (or applied for) by other sources or does not clearly demonstrate a program of research in the NSE.
Training of Highly Qualified Personnel	Past Training of HQP	Past training is at **the highest level** in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.	Past training is **far superior** to others in terms of research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.	Past training is **superior** to others in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.	Past training compares **favourably** with others in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.	Past training is **modest** relative to others in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.	Past training is **below an acceptable level** in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.
		Most HQP move on to **highly impactful** positions that require skills gained through the training received.	**Most** HQP move on to **impactful** positions that require skills gained through the training received.	HQP **generally** move on to **impactful** positions that require skills gained through the training received.	HQP **generally** move on to positions that require skills gained through the training received.	**Some** HQP move on to positions that require skills gained through the training received.	HQP **rarely** move on to positions that require skills gained through the training received.
	Training Philosophy & Research Training Plan	Training philosophy and research training plans are **of the highest quality**: **highly appropriate, clearly defined** and expected to produce **top quality** results in terms of the overall approach and specific projects for HQP.	Training philosophy and research training plans are **far superior**: **highly appropriate, clearly defined** and expected to produce **high quality** results in terms of the overall approach and specific projects for HQP.	Training philosophy and research training plans are **superior**: **highly appropriate**, **clearly defined** and expected to produce **quality** results in terms of the overall approach and specific projects for HQP.	Training philosophy and research training plans are **appropriate** and **clearly defined** in terms of the overall approach and specific projects for HQP.	Training philosophy and research training plans are **partially appropriate** and **partially defined** in terms of the overall approach and specific projects for HQP.	Training philosophy and research training plans are **not appropriate** and **not clearly defined** in terms of the overall approach and specific projects for HQP.
		Challenges related to equity, diversity and inclusion specific to the institution **and** field of research are **clearly described**.		Challenges related to equity, diversity and inclusion specific to the institution **and** field of research are **described**.	Challenges related to equity, diversity and inclusion specific to the institution **and/or** field of research are **described**.	Challenges related to equity, diversity and inclusion specific to the institution **and/or** field of research are **partially described**.	Challenges related to equity, diversity and inclusion specific to the institution **and/or** field of research are **inaccurate** or **not described**.
		Specific actions to support the recruitment of a diverse group of HQP **and** an inclusive research training environment are **clearly defined**.		Specific actions to support the recruitment of a diverse group of HQP **and** an inclusive research training environment are **defined**.	Specific actions to support the recruitment of a diverse group of HQP **and/or** an inclusive research training environment are **defined**.	Specific actions to support the recruitment of a diverse group of HQP **and/or** an inclusive research training environment are **partially defined**.	Specific actions to support the recruitment of a diverse group of HQP **and/or** an inclusive research training environment are **not appropriate** or **not defined**.