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Welcome, Introductions, and Overview of the Evaluation/Rating Process at NSERC

Research Facilitators & Planning Officers: Tips on HQP, EDI, CCV, and Internal Review

NSERC DG Evaluation Group Members: Tips from adjudication

Q&A

Session on RTI Grants: Research Facilitators and RTI Evaluation Group Members; Q&A
Research Facilitators and EG/RTI members presenting:

- **Ron Borowsky**, (NSERC Lead) Professor, Psychology (Cognition and Neuroscience); A&Sc
  *EG 1502 – Biological Systems & Functions* - Merit & Ratings

  **Research Facilitators:**

  - **Danielle Baron**, Ag & Bio - HQP
  - **Tera Ebach**, WCVM - EDI
  - **Heidi Smithson**, Engineering - CCV
  - **Manisha Jalla**, RASI - Internal Review

  **RTI Session:**

  - **Heidi Smithson**, Engineering
  - **Bruna Bonavia-Fisher**, Biomedical Departments, Medicine

- **Meena Sakharkar**, Professor, Biochemistry, Pharmacy and Nutrition
  *EG 1501 – Genes, Cells and Molecules*

- **Jaswant Singh**, Professor, Veterinary Biomedical Science; WCVM,
  *EG 1502 – Biological Systems and Functions*

- **Joel Lanovaz**, Professor, Kinesiology,
  *EG 1502 – Biological Systems and Functions*

- **Robert Scott**, Professor, Chemistry; A&Sc,
  *EG 1504 – Chemistry*

- **Ha Nguyen**, Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering; Engineering
  *EG 1510 – Electrical and Computer Engineering*

- **Thomas Fisher**, Professor, Anatomy, Physiology and Pharmacology; Medicine
  *RTI Evaluation Group: Genes, Cells and Molecules*

- **Michel Gravel**, Professor, Chemistry, A&Sc
  *RTI Evaluation Group: Chemistry*
The Merit “Grid”

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCEPTIONAL</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING</th>
<th>VERY STRONG</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>INSUFFICIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledged as a leader in terms of research excellence, accomplishments, and service.</td>
<td>Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are far superior to others.</td>
<td>Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are superior to others.</td>
<td>Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are significant.</td>
<td>Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are reasonable.</td>
<td>Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are below an acceptable level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions presented in the application are of the highest quality.</td>
<td>Contributions presented in the application are of high quality.</td>
<td>Contributions presented in the application are above average in quality.</td>
<td>Contributions presented in the application are of good quality.</td>
<td>Contributions presented in the application are of reasonable quality.</td>
<td>Contributions presented in the application are limited in quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact and importance of the work is clearly evident and influential.</td>
<td>Impact and importance of the work is clearly evident and influential.</td>
<td>Impact and importance of the work is clearly evident and influential.</td>
<td>Impact and importance of the work is evident.</td>
<td>Impact and importance of the work is somewhat evident.</td>
<td>Impact and importance of the work is not clearly evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Long-term goals and short-term objectives are clearly defined.</td>
<td>Long-term and short-term objectives are described.</td>
<td>Objectives are not clearly described and/or likely not attainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term vision and short-term objectives are clearly defined.</td>
<td>The methodology is clearly defined and appropriate.</td>
<td>The methodology is clearly defined and appropriate.</td>
<td>The methodology is described and appropriate.</td>
<td>The methodology is partially described and appropriate.</td>
<td>The methodology is not clearly described and/or appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application clearly demonstrates how the research activities to be supported are distinct from those funded (or applied for) by other sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Past training is at the highest 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.**

**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.**

**Challenges related to equity, diversity and inclusion specific to the institution and field of research are clearly described.**

**Specific actions to support the recruitment of a diverse group of HQP and an inclusive research training environment are clearly defined.**

**Past training is far superior to other applicants in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.**

**HQP generally move on to impactful positions that require skills gained through the training received.**

**Training philosophy and research training plans are superior: highly appropriate, clearly defined and expected to produce high quality results 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 described.**

**Specific actions to support the recruitment of a diverse group of HQP and an inclusive research training environment are defined.**

**Past training is superior to other applicants in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.**

**HQP generally move on to impactful positions that require skills gained through the training received.**

**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.**

**Challenges related to equity, diversity and inclusion specific to the institution and field of research are described.**

**Specific actions to support the recruitment of a diverse group of HQP and an inclusive research training environment are defined.**

**Past training compares favourably with other applicants in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.**

**HQP generally move on to positions that require skills gained through the training received.**

**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.**

**Challenges related to equity, diversity and inclusion specific to the institution and field of research are described.**

**Specific actions to support the recruitment of a diverse group of HQP and an inclusive research training environment are defined.**

**Past training is modest relative to other applicants in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.**

**HQP rarely move on to positions that require skills gained through the training received.**

**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 not accurately or not described.**

**Specific actions to support the recruitment of a diverse group of HQP and an inclusive research training environment are not appropriate or not defined.**

**Past training is below an acceptable level in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.**

**HQP rarely move on to positions that require skills gained through the training received.**

**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 not accurately or not described.**

**Specific actions to support the recruitment of a diverse group of HQP and an inclusive research training environment are not appropriate or not defined.**
### Excellence of the researcher

- Knowledge, expertise, and experience of the researcher in the NSE
- Quality and impact of contributions to the proposed research and/or other areas of research in the NSE
- Importance of contributions to, and use by, other research and end-users

### Merit of the proposal

- Originality and innovation
- Significance and expected contributions to NSE research; potential for policy- and/or technology-related impact
- Clarity and scope of objectives
- Clarity and appropriateness of methodology
- Feasibility
- Extent to which the scope of the proposal addresses all relevant issues
- Consideration of sex, gender and diversity in the research design, if applicable to the field
- Consideration of interdisciplinary methods or practices in research
- Appropriateness of, and justification for, the budget
- Demonstration that the DG proposal is distinct conceptually from research supported (or submitted for support) through CIHR and/or SSHRC
- Clear explanation why DG funding is essential to carry out the research proposed in the DG application (for applicants who hold or receive funds from a CIHR Foundation Grant)

### Contributions to the training of highly qualified personnel

- Quality and impact of past training
- Training environment
- HQP awards and research contributions
- Outcomes and skills gained by HQP
- Quality, suitability and clarity of the planned training
- Training philosophy
  - Mentorship approach and enhancement of the research and training environment
  - Challenges or barriers to inclusion and advancement of under-represented groups
  - Planned approach to promote participation of a diverse group of HQP
- Research training plan for individual HQP

---

**Rationale for rating:**
- Use summary to help outline this:
  - Originality and innovation
  - Developed new experimental paradigms, techniques, combined approaches?
  - Significance and expected contributions to NSE research; potential for policy- and/or technology-related impact
  - Model/theory development, long-term "story", socioeconomic/environmental impact?
  - Clarity and scope of objectives
  - Long-term goals/visions (model/theory?) and short-term objectives (experiments/studies?) clearly defined?
  - Clarity and appropriateness of methodology
  - Understandable for general scientific audience, credibility (publications involving these methods)?
  - Feasibility:
    - Can be done by their lab, has relevant experience (if not, clear plan, but "story" should fit you)
    - Consideration of sex, gender and diversity in the research design, if applicable
    - If not applicable, should clearly state why, but give this careful consideration
    - Extent to which the scope of the proposal addresses all relevant issues
    - You control the scope of this "story", not too big or too small...
    - Appropriateness of, and justification for, the budget:
      - Reasonable, use tables for clarity (e.g., funds for HQP in which years), "get the funding then do what you want"
      - Demonstration that the Discovery Grant proposal is distinct conceptually from research supported (or submitted for support) through CIHR and/or SSHRC
      - Summaries from grants, but clear statements of "no conceptual or budgetary overlap" are helpful
      - Clear explanation why Discovery Grant funding is essential to carry out the research proposed in the DG application (for applicants who hold or have applied for a CIHR Foundation Grant)
      - Why couldn’t the CIHR Foundation grant cover this work?

---
## Excellence of Researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCEPTIONAL</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING</th>
<th>VERY STRONG</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>INSUFFICIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledged as a leader in terms of research excellence, accomplishments, and service. Contributions presented in the application are of the highest level of quality.</td>
<td>Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are far superior to others. Contributions presented in the application are of high quality.</td>
<td>Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are superior to others. Contributions presented in the application are above average in quality.</td>
<td>Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are significant. Contributions presented in the application are of good quality.</td>
<td>Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are reasonable. Contributions presented in the application are of reasonable quality.</td>
<td>Research excellence, accomplishments, and service are below an acceptable level. Contributions presented in the application are limited in quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rationale for rating:
- Knowledge, expertise, and experience of the researcher in the NSE
  - current/past positions, PDF, PhD, etc. (in what areas?)
  - awards/recognitions/service (research, teaching, NSE community, may apply to the probes below also)?
- Quality and impact of contributions to the proposed research and/or other areas of research in the NSE
  - grants awarded (co-I or PI?)
  - editorial boards?
  - publications (quantity/quality, lead/senior author, HQP on them and marked with * ?)
  - presentations (invited?)
  - most significant contributions (number of citations; for long-term themes capturing current work, recent impact?)
- Importance of contributions to, and use by, other research and end-users
  - knowledge translation?
  - media coverage?
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# Merit of the Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCEPTIAL</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING</th>
<th>VERY STRONG</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>INSUFFICIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. Long-term vision and short-term objectives are clearly defined. The methodology is clearly defined and appropriate.</td>
<td>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. Long-term goals are clearly defined and short-term objectives are well planned. The methodology is clearly described and appropriate.</td>
<td>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. Long-term goals are clearly defined and short-term objectives are well planned. The methodology is described and appropriate.</td>
<td>Proposed research program is clearly presented, has original and innovative aspects and may have impact and/or address socio-economic or environmental needs. Long-term and short-term objectives are clearly described. The methodology is partially described and/or appropriate.</td>
<td>Proposed research program, as presented lacks clarity, and/or is of limited originality and innovation. Objectives are not clearly described and/or likely not attainable. The methodology is not clearly described and/or appropriate.</td>
<td>Proposed research program 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 NSF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Rationale for rating:

- **use summary to help outline this!**
- **Originality and innovation**
  - developed new experimental paradigms, techniques, combined approaches?
- **Significance and expected contributions to NSE research; potential for policy- and/or technology-related impact**
  - model/theory development, long-term “story”, socioeconomic/environmental impact?
- **Clarity and scope of objectives**
  - long term goals/vision (model/theory?) and short term objectives (experiments/studies?) clearly defined?
- **Clarity and appropriateness of methodology**
  - understandable for general scientific audience, credibility (publications involving these methods)?
- **Feasibility**
  - can be done by their lab, has relevant experience (if not, clear plan, but “story” should fit you)
  - Consideration of sex, gender and diversity in the research design, if applicable
  - if not applicable, should clearly state why, but give this careful consideration
- **Extent to which the scope of the proposal addresses all relevant issues**
  - you control the scope of this “story”, not too big or too small...
  - Appropriateness of, and justification for, the budget
  - reasonable, use tables for clarity (e.g., funds for HQP in which years), “get the funding then do what you want”
- **Demonstration that the Discovery Grant proposal is distinct conceptually from research supported (or submitted for support) through CIHR and/or SSHRC**
  - summaries from grants, but clear statements of “no conceptual or budgetary overlap” are helpful
- **Clear explanation why Discovery Grant funding is essential to carry out the research proposed in the DG application (for applicants who hold or have applied for a CIHR Foundation Grant)**
  - why couldn’t the CIHR Foundation grant cover this work?
## Training of HQP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCEPTIONAL</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING</th>
<th>VERY STRONG</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>INSUFFICIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post training is at the highest level in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.</td>
<td>Post training is far superior to other applicants in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.</td>
<td>Post training is superior to other applicants in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.</td>
<td>Post training compares favourably with other applicants in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.</td>
<td>Post training is modest relative to other applicants in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.</td>
<td>Post training is below an acceptable level in terms of the research training environment provided and HQP contributions to research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most HQP move on to highly impactful positions that require skills gained through the training received.**

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.

Challenges related to equity, diversity and inclusion specific to the institution and field of research are clearly described.

Specific actions to support the recruitment of a diverse group of HQP and an inclusive research training environment are clearly defined.

---

### Rationale for rating:

- **Past contributions to the training of HQP**
  - UGs, Masters, PhDs, PDFs, techs, all count, knowing where they ended up shows you care and are proud!
    - Training environment
    - lab(s), training, techniques and equipment, academic programming, seminars
    - HQP awards and research contributions
    - highlight scholarships and research contributions (students in lead roles?)
    - Outcomes and skills gained by HQP
    - HQP go on to PDF, faculty, industry jobs, etc
  - Training plan
  - Training philosophy
    - pedagogical approaches, frequent interaction (not just “weekly lab meetings”), social aspects (team building),
    - HQP research training plan
    - name HQP where possible in proposal, and provide details here about who is doing what and why
  - **EDI of HQP!** (see slides from our next 2 presenters)
Research Facilitators

Discovery Grants:
- Danielle Baron, Ag & Bio - HQP
- Tera Ebach, WCVM - EDI
- Heidi Smithson, Engineering - CCV
- Manisha Jalla, RASI - Int. Review
HQP Considerations (Appendix 5, 2021-22 Peer Review Manual)

### Contributions to the training of highly qualified personnel

- Quality and impact of past training
  - Training environment
  - HQP awards and research contributions
  - Outcomes and skills gained by HQP
- Quality, suitability and clarity of the planned training
  - Training philosophy
    - Mentorship approach and enhancement of the research and training environment
    - Challenges or barriers to inclusion and advancement of under-represented groups
    - Planned approach to promote participation of a diverse group of HQP
  - Research training plan for individual HQP

### Past training:
- Don’t worry if you are an ECR and this is your first research program!
- Undergrads, Masters, PhD, PDFs, technicians, research assistants, summer students
- Highlight your lab facilities, specialized equipment/techniques, academic programs/training
- Discuss past awards, presentations that HQP did
- Where they are now – industry, academia – show that you have kept in touch!
Training plan:

1) Training philosophy
   - Your approach to supervising students and mentorship
   - Team building, frequent (virtual) interactions, pedagogical approaches

2) Research training plan
   - Do not just list your HQP!
   - Describe specifically which HQP will be responsible for which aspects of the research and WHY
   - Ensure this is mirrored in your methods section in your proposal
   - Can include a Gantt chart in your budget just.
   - Use names where possible

### Contributions to the training of highly qualified personnel

- Quality and impact of past training
  - Training environment
  - HQP awards and research contributions
  - Outcomes and skills gained by HQP
- Quality, suitability and clarity of the planned training
  - Training philosophy
    - Mentorship approach and enhancement of the research and training environment
    - Challenges or barriers to inclusion and advancement of under-represented groups
  - Planned approach to promote participation of a diverse group of HQP
  - Research training plan for individual HQP
Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) on Discovery Grants

- Institution or College EDI challenges
- Field of Research EDI challenges
- USask commitments for EDI recruitment that address Institution challenges
- Include your own specific EDI recruitment practices that address both USask and discipline EDI Challenges.
- USask resources for an Inclusive research training environment that address EDI challenges.
- Include your own specific training plan practices that address USask and Field EDI challenges
- Sex and Gender in research design
Top Tips for CCV

- Start Early!
- Use the NSERC CCV template (under Funded on the CV tab)
- Follow the PDF Guide provided by NSERC in the NSERC template
- Make good use of extra space
- Mark your HQP with asterisks following their surnames
- Visit the Grants Repository to see samples of CVs from past successful applications (https://vpresearch.usask.ca/events/grants-calendar.php)
- Contact your RF or RASI with questions or issues
- Attend the fall CCV and DG application clinic (dates and times will be announced later in the summer).
Use the NSERC CV Template

- To select the NSERC CCV template, choose ‘Funded’ under the CV tab, search for NSERC under funding source, then select NSERC_Researcher for CV Type.
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Follow the PDF provided by NSERC

Specific instructions from NSERC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Included/Entries</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>2018-07-18 08:09:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Skills</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2015-07-21 13:08:37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Make good use of extra space

- Note that many of the text boxes in CCV have a lot of space. You can use this space to provide additional information about entries (e.g., award received for a paper, etc.)
Mark your HQP with asterisks following their surnames
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DG-Evaluation Group</th>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Department and College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1501: Genes, Cells &amp; Molecules</td>
<td>Susan Detmer, Troy Harkness, Meena Sakhar, Julia Boughner, Yan Zhou, Peter Bretscher, Jack Gray, Mirek Cygler, Patrick Krone (Emeritus Professor), Daniel MacPhee</td>
<td>Veterinary Pathology, WCVM BMI, College of Medicine College Pharmacy and Nutrition APP, College of Medicine VIDO BMI, College of Medicine Biology, College of Arts and Science BMI, College of Medicine Anatomy &amp; Cell Biology, College of Medicine Veterinary Biomedical Sciences, WCVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503: Evolution &amp; Ecology</td>
<td>Robert Clark</td>
<td>Global Institute for Water Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507: Computer Science</td>
<td>Chanchal Roy, Julita Vassileva, Regan Mandryk, Fangxiang Wu</td>
<td>Computer Science, Arts and Science Computer Science, Arts and Science Computer Science, Arts and Science Computer Science, Arts and Science; Mechanical Engineering, CoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509: Civil, Industrial &amp; Systems Engineering</td>
<td>Dena McMartin</td>
<td>Institutional Planning and Assessment Civil, Geological and Environmental Engg, CoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511: Materials &amp; Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>Ajay Dalai</td>
<td>Chemical and Biological Engineering, CoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1502: Biological Systems and Functions</td>
<td>Jaswant Singh, Joel Lanovaz, John Howland, Ron Borowsky, Greg Penner, Yangdou Wei, Jack Gray, John P Giesy</td>
<td>Veterinary Biomedical Sciences, WCVM College of Kinesiology APP, College of Medicine Psychology, College of Arts and Science Animal and Poultry Science, AgBio Biology, College of Arts and Science Biology, College of Arts and Science Veterinary Biomedical Sciences, WCVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504: Chemistry</td>
<td>David Palmer, Robert Scott</td>
<td>Chemistry, College of Arts and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1506: Geosciences</td>
<td>Adam Bourassa, Yuanming Pan, Steven Siciliano</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Engg. Physics, Arts and Science Geological Sciences, Arts and Science Soil Sciences, AgBio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508: Math &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>Raymond Spiteri, Juxin Liu</td>
<td>Computer Science, Arts and Science Mathematics and Statistics, Arts and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510: Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Ha Nguyen, Safa O Kasap</td>
<td>Electrical and Computer Engineering, CoE Electrical and Computer Engineering, CoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512: Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Carey J Simonson, James Johnston, Xiongbiao Chen</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering, CoE Mechanical Engineering, CoE Mechanical Engineering, CoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI Evaluation Group</td>
<td>Faculty Name</td>
<td>Department and College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genes, Cells &amp; Molecules</td>
<td>Thomas Fisher</td>
<td>APP, College of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wei Xiao</td>
<td>BMI, College of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Krone</td>
<td>Anatomy &amp; Cell Biology, College of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Emeritus Professor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>Robert Clark</td>
<td>Global Institute for Water Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christy Morrissey</td>
<td>School of Environment and Sustainability; Biology, College of Arts and Science; Toxicology Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Systems and Functions</td>
<td>Jaswant Singh</td>
<td>Veterinary Biomedical Sciences, WCVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valerie Thompson</td>
<td>Psychology College of Arts and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Michel Gravel</td>
<td>Chemistry, College of Arts and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>Qiaqin Yang</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering, CoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Ildiko Badea</td>
<td>College of Pharmacy and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Researchers from USask who are currently holding (or have recently held NSERC Discovery Grant)

Please refer to this list while suggesting internal reviewers, if you are participating in the USask Internal Review Program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DG</th>
<th>RTI</th>
<th>REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Applicants initiate their intention to apply and/or request for internal review by submitting the Intention to Apply/Request for Internal Review Form for NSERC DG/RTI to <a href="mailto:grant.review@usask.ca">grant.review@usask.ca</a>. Please put ‘Lastname NSERC DG/RTI’ in the subject heading.</td>
<td>Anytime before July 26, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>NSERC Deadline for Submission of DG Notification of Intent (NOI) to Apply NOI must be submitted to NSERC through the <a href="https://www.nserc-rsc.ca/">NSERC Research Portal</a>.</td>
<td>August 2, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants participating in the internal review, please e-mail a copy of your submitted NSERC DG NOI to <a href="mailto:grant.review@usask.ca">grant.review@usask.ca</a> (306-966-7521). Please put ‘Lastname NSERC DG’ in the subject heading.</td>
<td>August 9, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Applicants consult with their suggested reviewers, Research Facilitators, Associate/Vice-Deans Research, or mentorship teams to strategize and prepare their draft application.</td>
<td>Anytime between now and September 14 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Applicants submit draft DG and/or RTI application and CCV for internal review to their internal reviewers, and copy to <a href="mailto:grant.review@usask.ca">grant.review@usask.ca</a>. Please put ‘Lastname NSERC DG/RTI’ in the subject heading.</td>
<td>September 15, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Internal reviews are returned to the applicants and copy to <a href="mailto:grant.review@usask.ca">grant.review@usask.ca</a> directly from internal reviewers (or from <a href="mailto:grant.review@usask.ca">grant.review@usask.ca</a> if assistance is needed).</td>
<td>October 7, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Applicants consult with their suggested reviewers, Research Facilitators, Associate/Vice-Deans Research, or mentorship teams to incorporate reviewer feedback. Research Facilitator reads for the logistical flow and completion of the proposal.</td>
<td>October 7 – 14 (RTI) October 7 – 21 (DG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>College/Unit Internal Approval Applicants must submit a full application package including CCV through UnivRS for Department and College academic approval. Applicants comply with college/unit-specific internal approval processes and deadlines.</td>
<td>Please check with your Research Facilitator or Associate/Vice Dean Research/Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Acceleration and Strategic Initiatives (RASI) Compliance Review and Approval (RTI) College/school/unit of the applicant must review the application, decide on approval and submit the decision in University Research System (UnivRS) at least 5 business days prior to the agency submission deadline. RSEO will review for eligibility, conduct a final compliance review check and provide Institutional approval. Applicants will have the opportunity to incorporate any required changes they wish to address or as noted by RASI. Paper applications will not be accepted.</td>
<td>October 18, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RTI deadlines

### RASI submission deadline (DG)
(ask your RF for earlier college/dept deadlines)

### DG deadline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSERC RTI Submission Deadline</td>
<td>October 25, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final applications must be submitted by applicants to NSERC through the NSERC Research Portal, and will be forwarded by the RASI staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Acceleration and Strategic Initiatives (RASI) Compliance Review and Approval (DG)</td>
<td>October 24, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/school/unit of the applicant must review the application, decide on approval and submit the decision in University Research System (UnivRS) at least 5 business days prior to the agency submission deadline. RSEO will review for eligibility, conduct a final compliance review check and provide Institutional approval. Applicants will have the opportunity to incorporate any required changes they wish to address or as noted by RASI. Paper applications will not be accepted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSERC Discovery Grant/RTI Workshop: Workshop Highlights</td>
<td>November 1, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Specific strategies relevant to the merit indicators;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Top tips and advice from:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research Facilitators on CCV, HQP, Equity, Diversity and Inclusivity (EDI) considerations, and Internal Review;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Experienced NSERC Evaluation Group members regarding successful applications;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Session focused on RTI grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSERC DG Submission Deadline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final applications must be submitted by applicants to NSERC through the NSERC Research Portal, and will be forwarded by the RASI staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Webinars and Information Sessions Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DG Webinar: Submission of a Notification of Intent to Apply (English) Live Q&amp;A</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI Webinar: Submission of an Application (English)</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG Webinar: Submission of an Application (English)</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USask Q&amp;A session for DG and RTI Applicants including information on CCV and Full Application in Research Portal</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Workshop Highlights

- Specific strategies relevant to the merit indicators;
- Top tips and advice from:
  - Research Facilitators on CCV, HQP, Equity, Diversity and Inclusivity (EDI) considerations, and Internal Review;
  - Experienced NSERC Evaluation Group members regarding successful applications;
- Session focused on RTI grants
DG Evaluation Group Members

• Meena Sakharkar, *EG 1501 – Genes, Cells and Molecules*
• Jaswant Singh, *EG 1502 – Biological Systems and Functions*
• Joel Lanovaz, *EG 1502 – Biological Systems and Functions*
• Robert Scott, *EG 1504 – Chemistry*
• Ha Nguyen, *EG 1510 – Electrical and Computer Engineering*
• It is imperative to use the Merit Indicators grid.
• Make sure your CV and your application are consistent in manuscripts, grants and students/HQP.
• If your lab does health science related research, please indicate the basic science component and contribution (for each article).
• Simplify as much as possible. It is your job to make ensure that the reviewers understand your grant. Reviewer’s may (sometimes) not be area experts.
• **Clearly indicate:**
  • Long term goals and short term objectives.
  • Novelty of the proposed research.
  • Manuscripts where you are corresponding/co-corresponding/lead author.
  • Training philosophy and Training plan **for each HQP**.
  • Your HQP, their contributions and their current whereabouts.
  • Your EDI philosophy (do not copy from others).
  • If you hold a CIHR grant, clearly indicate the difference from the proposed NSERC grant.
• Reviewers provided by you (not - over extremely critical/supportive).
**The Grid** is our God during the Competition week

- Evaluation Group members breath-in and live by the Grid!
- R1 and R2 are your friends and advocates
  - Help them
- As R1, I get only 3-4 minute to present your case!
- What rationale would you like to appear on the Evaluation Form
  - Fill in the form for someone from USask database (i.e., understand the Grid)
- Keep the story simple
  - Weaving the story between different sections (=multiple iterations)
- Pay attention to EDI and keep CIHR domains out
  - What specific EDI actions are you taking?

---

Jaswant.singh@usask.ca
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE GRID IS ABSOLUTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Pay close attention to the Merit Indicator rubric; i.e. “the grid”

Find ways to highlight impact of your work
(Most Significant Contributions section - not a just list of pubs!)

Make sure CCV matches the application; pay attention to details
(e.g. Use * to highlight HQP!!)

Work to get the right balance of big picture and methodological detail
(Need to show you can do it but also need to sell the innovation/impact)

Needs to read like a program of research
(not a series of experiments; not just an incremental advance)

Highlight what is unique/special about the experience that HQP receive
Some of the issues I noted this past year that led to poorer outcomes:

1. Delays in Research: **Quantify your delays.** NSERC allows you to attach a supplementary contributions to research document. Only a minority of applicants take advantage of this.

2. Description of EDI challenges in both your field of research and institution. **Explicitly** state what these challenges are for both, and provide several concrete action plans.

3. Most Significant Contributions to Research: These should be used to describe your expertise and the impact of your work, and need not be publication specific (i.e. they should not be paper abstracts). **Be specific about evidence of the impact of your work.**

4. Collaborations: Many people collaborate, but it is incumbent to describe your role in all collaborations. If you publish with other co-PIs often, be explicit about what your role is on these publications.
Excellence of the Researcher: Fundings, awards, publications (credible venues, student authorship, large or small number of co-authors, explanation of collaboration in multi-authors papers), description of most significant contributions, quality and relevance of sample contributions

Merit of Proposal: Topic is current/emerging, originality and innovation with respect to the state-of-the-art (references are up to date, relevant and from the mainstream journals/conferences in the field), clarity and scope of long-term/short-term objectives, clarity and appropriateness of methodology, favorable to build on results/expertise from past research, clear description of HQP roles.

HQP Training: Quality and impact of past training (description of training environment, HQP awards and high-quality publications, HQP employment, HQP further studies), description of training philosophy and research training plan.
Q&A: Discovery Grants

Please either type your question into the chat, or raise your hand!
RTI: Research Facilitators

- Bruna Bonavia-Fisher, Biomedical Departments, Medicine
- Heidi Smithson, Engineering

RTI: Evaluation Group Members

- Thomas Fisher, RTI Evaluation Group: Genes, Cells and Molecules
- Michel Gravel, RTI Evaluation Group: Chemistry
✓ foster and enhance the **discovery, innovation and training** of university researchers in the NSE by supporting the purchase of research equipment - 1 year; up to $150K.

✓ applicants and co-applicants must each hold a DG or one of the grants in their list, can only submit **one application per competition**, either as an applicant or a co-applicant but not both.

✓ for tools and instruments that form a comprehensive system, or the purchase of new, used or refurbished equipment, for the repair, upgrade or rental of equipment, or for the fabrication of equipment that is not readily available off the shelf

✓ **Success rate:** 28%
SUMMARY of proposal

PROPOSAL

Free form proposal limited to four pages

- need, urgency and suitability of equipment for the research programs (40%)

- merit of the research programs supported by the equipment and excellence of the applicant(s) (40%)

- importance of the equipment for the training of HQP (20%)

  - Quality and extent of training;
  - Opportunity for hands-on training; and
  - Potential to provide marketable skills for students trained on the equipment.

  - Consideration of equity, diversity and inclusion in the training of HQP.
# Budget

**Budget justification** limited to **two pages**

1. must contain only information pertinent to the budget and relationship to other research support.

2. Supported by a template table to fill

3. include two quotations for over $25,000. If you cannot provide them, provide a justification under a clear heading

## Budget Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table template</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal:
Institutional tax rate (%):
Total tax:
Total cost:
Total confirmed from other source(s):
Total requested from NSERC:
CCV

applicant and each of the co-applicants must submit a CCV
Equity, diversity and inclusion considerations

Very important part of the application, helps you differentiate yourself from the rest of the applications in the pile.

Give concrete examples of the actions that Usask, your department and your laboratory (and co-applicants’s) take to advance underrepresented groups AND provide the best inclusive and nurturing environment to work in.
Research Tools and Instruments (RTI)

- foster and enhance the discovery, innovation and training capability of university researchers in the NSE by supporting the purchase of research equipment - 1 year; up to $150K.
- applicants and co-applicants must each hold a DG or one of the grants in their list, can only submit one application per competition, either as an applicant or a co-applicant but not both.
- for tools and instruments that form a comprehensive system, or the purchase of new, used or refurbished equipment, for the repair, upgrade or rental of equipment, or for the fabrication of equipment that is not readily available off the shelf
- **Success rate:** 28%

Free form proposal limited to **four pages**

1. need, urgency and suitability of equipment for the research programs (40%)
2. merit of the research programs supported by the equipment and excellence of the applicant(s) (40%)
3. importance of the equipment for the training of highly qualified personnel (HQP) (20%)

Budget justification limited to **two pages**

1. must contain only information pertinent to the budget and relationship to other research support.
2. Supported by a template table to fill
3. include two quotations for over $25,000.

If you cannot provide them, provide a justification under a clear heading

**CCV** applicant and each of the co-applicants must submit a CCV

**Equity, diversity and inclusion considerations**

*Very important* part of the application, helps you differentiate yourself from the rest of the applications in the pile. Give concrete examples of the actions that Usask, your department and your laboratory take to advance underrepresented groups AND provide the best inclusive and nurturing environment to work in.
Reviewed 29 RTI applications beginning from 2016/17 – 2020/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Co-Applicants</th>
<th>Total # applications in category</th>
<th>% of total applications</th>
<th># of successful applications</th>
<th>Success rate as % of total applications</th>
<th>% of awarded vs. total in category</th>
<th>% of total successful applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ (usually 4+)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence of the Researcher(s)</td>
<td>PI and Co-Is are highly funded; have large HQP teams and outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage</td>
<td>Applications with multiple applicants show much higher usage rates in the proposals; successful applications provide a detailed usage and management plan, including time built in for other users (internal and external, with specific other users identified).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linked to other funding success</td>
<td>Successful applications emphasize a direct link between equipment and success on other programs such as meeting DG objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary/Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>Co-Is from at least other departments and usually other colleges; wide range of research areas in a single application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration History</td>
<td>Teams tend to have multiple co-authored publications and jointly-held funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Full or close to full $150,000 requested (vs. very low success rates below $100,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># HQP trained</td>
<td>Applications with multiple applicants have significantly more HQP to be trained (e.g., over 20 HQP/yr vs. fewer than 10 over 6 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Characteristics of Unsuccessful RTIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellence of the Researcher(s)</strong></td>
<td>Limited array of funding sources; fewer collaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usage</strong></td>
<td>Limited usage – likely due to single or small number of Co-Is (e.g., PI will use 100% of time but only 10 hrs/month); vague reference to other users or possible future collaborations (all unnamed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links to other funding success</strong></td>
<td>Limited/lacking reference to success of other funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multidisciplinary/Interdisciplinary</strong></td>
<td>Challenging to demonstrate exposure of HQP to multidisciplinary environment as a lone applicant or small team with limited collaboration history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration History</strong></td>
<td>Limited/lacking collaboration history among the team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds Requested</strong></td>
<td>Small amount of funding requested ($20,000 – 40,000); likely just an indicator of other problems in the proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># HQP trained</strong></td>
<td>Limited # of HQP to be trained; often the number of expected HQP doesn’t align with past training numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Significant time spent describing the research/overly technical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What does all of this mean?

- Larger teams fair better because:
  - They can demonstrate significantly more use and impact
  - They train more HQP
  - They can demonstrate more collaboration and multidisciplinarity
  - The size of the team ensures each section of the proposal is more succinct and less technical
Smaller dollar value proposals:
- Tend to be single applicants or small teams
- Seem to be less polished

Excellence of the Researcher(s)
- This does appear to have some import, but it is not the whole story as sometimes the same excellent applicants are not funded.
- The proposal still needs to have the other qualities mentioned.
Tips

- Start working early to give yourself lots of time to put together a larger team or identify (confirm) other users
  - Work with your Research Facilitator to help identify potential collaborators in other units
- If you’re a single applicant or small team, don’t feel compelled to fill up all the pages. Keep the writing succinct, specific, and not overly technical.
- If you’re asking for a small dollar amount, put the same effort in as you would for the full $150,000.
- Smaller teams need to be realistic about number of HQP trained (compensate by identifying other users)
- Find and follow examples in the Grants Repository. You can adapt the qualities of a larger-team proposal to a small one.
We are not likely to be expert in your field (I had rated my comfort level as “high” in only 4 of the 21 applications I reviewed).

We have a lot of applications to review – keep them simple and focused on the criteria.

There are different ways to argue for need, urgency, and merit - identify your strengths and state them clearly and often.

The process requires reviewers to essentially rank each application in each of the three categories - weakness in any of them can sink your chances.

Pay careful attention to HQP and EDI.
Tips for a Successful RTI Application

- **Need, urgency and suitability (40%)**
  - Demonstrate instrument is essential and not currently available
  - Intensive use of instrument: # of users, # hours/month
  - Shared instrument: # of applicants, # of users

- **Feasibility and impact (40%)**
  - Excellence of research program and of applicant
  - EDI in team composition (applicants)

- **Training of HQP (20%)**
  - Quality and importance of training on this instrument
  - Shared instrument: # of applicants, # of users
  - EDI in users

**Assessment Notes Template: RTI**
Q&A: RTI Grants

- Please either type your question into the chat, or raise your hand!
• **NSERC Resources:**

  - [NSERC Instructions](http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/ResearchPortal-PortailDeRecherche/Instructions-Instructions/DG-SD_eng.asp)

  - **NSERC Presentation Standards** (fonts, margins etc.) are at: [http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/OnlineServices-ServicesEnLigne/pdfatt2_eng.asp](http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/OnlineServices-ServicesEnLigne/pdfatt2_eng.asp)


Application Preparation Resources

• **USask Resources:**

  - USask NSERC DG repository
    https://share.usask.ca/go/ovpr/grants_repository/

  - Videos and slides from our previous NSERC grant workshops
    Workshops and Tipsheets - Research Acceleration and Strategic Initiatives - Office of the Vice-President Research - University of Saskatchewan (usask.ca)

  - Comprehensive list of resources available for the EDI component of your Discovery Grant application:
    https://usaskca1-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/maj944_usask_ca/EYGxUNh9HdZNhcWOjgrMZpgBpjpmZ1L6ryF5icyVf9vFLg?e=HENzqh
NSERC Research Facilitation & Planning Team

- **NSERC Leader:** Ron Borowsky
- **Research Development Specialist, Research Acceleration and Strategic Initiatives:** Manisha Jalla

**Research Facilitators**

- **Agriculture and Bioresources:** Danielle Baron
- **Arts and Science:** Colleen Cochran
- **Edwards School of Business:** Joelena Leader
- **Engineering:** Heidi Smithson
- **Johnson-Shoyama School of Public Policy:** Bethany Penn
- **Dentistry and School of Public Health:** Janice Michael
- **Kinesiology/Pharmacy and Nutrition:** Gen Clark
- **Medicine:** Biomedical Departments (BMI, APP): Bruna Bonavia-Fisher; Department of Medicine: Ozlem Sari
  Department of Surgery: Karen Mosier; Department of Pediatrics: Tova Dybvig
  Department of Psychiatry: Mariam Alaverdashvili; Departments of Family Medicine, Medical Imaging, Obstetrics & Gynecology, Oncology, Ophthalmology, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine: Mark Milne
- **Western College of Veterinary Medicine:** Tera Ebach
- **School of Environment and Sustainability:** Graham Fairhurst
- **Research Acceleration and Strategic Initiatives (Large Scale Grants):** James Dobson

[www.usask.ca](http://www.usask.ca)
## Research Support Specialists, Research Acceleration and Strategic Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges / Schools</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Science</td>
<td>Nicole Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards School of</td>
<td>Laurie Schimpf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public</td>
<td>Brenda Meyer-Burt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Cameron Berg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Ronda Appell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Forensic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Co-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CUISR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioresources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Food Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Water Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Environment and Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicology Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine &amp; Infectious Disease Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy and Nutrition</td>
<td>No name listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing; Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>No name listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan Population Health and Evaluation Research Unit (SPHERU)</td>
<td>No name listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Centre for Health and Safety in Agriculture (CCHSA)</td>
<td>No name listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Peoples' Health Research Centre</td>
<td>No name listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>