

SSHRC  CRSH

**MEETING OF SSHRC LEADERS
DECEMBER 12TH, 2008**

IDRC Conference Centre
Room W. David Hopper (A & B)
150 Kent Street, 8th Floor
(between Albert and Slater)
Ottawa



Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en
sciences humaines du Canada

Canada 

SSHRC LEADERS – SUMMARY OF DECEMBER 12, 2008, MEETING

Background

SSHRC Leaders are senior university administrators appointed by their university presidents to serve as points of contact between SSHRC and their respective universities. Leaders provide a stable, ongoing channel of communication between their institutions and SSHRC. They relay information to their colleagues on new policy and program developments and also gather information and ideas from the university community that feed into the development of SSHRC policies and programs. *SSHRC Leaders* and SSHRC managers meet periodically, both in person and by teleconference. Leaders have been named at 64 institutions (see list at <http://www.sshrc.ca/site/about-crsh/committees-comites/leaders-eng.aspx>).

December 12 meeting

On December 12, 2008, the first major *SSHRC Leaders* meeting was held in Ottawa. A total of about 70 individuals attended the meeting, including 38 *SSHRC Leaders*, 6 delegates of *SSHRC Leaders*, SSHRC's President and four Vice-Presidents, most SSHRC directors, and other SSHRC staff. The meeting was also attended by Angela Ferrante (member of Council) and Mingjun Lu (member of SSHRC's new Programs and Quality Committee).

Structuring of the meeting

Four key objectives guided preparations for the meeting:

1. to develop a consensual agenda, drawn from the insights of both SSHRC managers and *SSHRC Leaders*;
2. to provide substantive information to Leaders on current SSHRC priorities and provide some "ground-truthing" regarding these priorities as experienced by the institutions;
3. to ensure a balanced exchange between SSHRC managers and *SSHRC Leaders*;
4. to allow as much general input and exchange of ideas and information as possible.

To initiate development of the meeting agenda, a meeting of SSHRC directors was held July 31, 2008. A teleconference was then held on August 8 with a representative group of *SSHRC Leaders* to gauge their support for the proposed agenda. The resulting preliminary agenda was sent out to all *SSHRC Leaders* on August 29 inviting further feedback on what topics should be addressed during the first Leaders meeting.

Four agenda topics were identified:

1. "Peer review: how to value and encourage faculty contributions in light of declining participation in the review process?"
2. "Inter-agency programming and collaboration: Where are the opportunities from the institutional perspective?"
3. "Evolving Federal and SSHRC thematic research priorities: gaps and emerging opportunities?"
4. "Incentives, support and resources for knowledge mobilization."

The objective of providing substantive information to Leaders was met by developing a binder of briefing notes on current SSHRC priorities. The binder was mailed to Leaders in advance of the meeting (see attached List of Documents for Leaders Meeting). SSHRC's president, Chad Gaffield, also opened the meeting with a thorough update on Council's strategic framework, Framing our Direction, as presented to Council's Board of Directors in October 2008 (mandate, values, key objectives, complexity/diversity/creativity, the changing research environment, federal initiatives, strategic ambitions, internal and external engagement).

The objective of ensuring a balanced exchange between SSHRC managers and *SSHRC Leaders* was met, in part, by combining an opening panel of four SSHRC VPs with a panel of four *SSHRC Leaders*. The Leaders were asked to respond to the SSHRC VPs' presentations, but were also encouraged to focus on whichever issues and information they thought relevant to the meeting.

The panel of SSHRC VPs focused on highlights of SSHRC priorities, drawing on material in the binder. Some of the topics covered:

Corporate direction and planning:

- SSHRC's strategic framework document, *Framing our Direction* (quality, connections and impact);
- the Federal Government's Science and Technology Strategy and relations with the new Minister of State (Science and Technology);
- the Canada Excellence Research Chairs (CERC);
- the restructuring of Council committees (e.g., formation of the new Programs and Quality standing committee);
- tri-agency research ethics;
- communications with the academic community (e.g., via *SSHRC Leaders*);
- the report by Ron Freedman on the economic impact of the humanities and social sciences (copy provided in the binder).

Grants and Scholarships:

- the new Vanier scholarships;
- Continuous Improvement;
- program architecture and consultations;
- the Blue Ribbon Panel Review and its successful online survey with researchers;
- campus-community partnering, leveraging of resources.

Partnerships

- SSHRC's Partnerships Strategy;
- thematic research priorities and joint initiatives;
- the federal investment in Environment & North research;
- a proactive approach to thematic research priorities;
- the International CURA program;
- the two-way and 'big tent' nature of knowledge mobilization (KMB);
- ICT technologies (digital humanities, open access).

Support systems and services:

- information management and business transformation;
- Enterprise Award Management System (EAMS) - proof of concept phase;
- the Common CV;
- the Consortia for Advancing Standards in Research Administration Information (CASRAI) and the focus on standardizing data.

The second panel included presentations by Harley Dickinson from the University of Saskatchewan, Monique Brodeur from UQAM, David Dewitt from York University, and Nancy Gallini from UBC. Topics covered:

- the social science research laboratory developed at the University of Saskatchewan (includes support for web-based and telephone-based interviews; an economic behavioural lab; use of data sets; GIS systems; and mobile interviews);
- the SSHRC Leader's forum held at the University of Saskatchewan (involved associate deans from all fields, plus research coordinators);
- current KMB initiatives at UQAM;
- the need to set award amounts appropriately at each level of graduate work (per research by Yves Gingras);
- questions related to the duration of Standard Research Grants: whether a grant period of 4 or 5 years would be advantageous in terms of support for professors and their work, optimal use of data, and a decrease in the number of requests by researchers (reducing the workload of both preparing and evaluating applications);
- concerns over non-used data and research;
- the value to KMB of partnerships between researchers and Radio Canada and TV outlets;
- the issue of transfer of funds on campus (a large majority of university faculty and students are active in the social sciences and humanities, but funds are often shifted to other fields);
- the need for institutional capacity or infrastructure in KMB;
- the need to revise approaches to the "alternate" (4A) grant category used by SSHRC and to support junior (pre-tenure) scholars;
- the need for support of research centres and institutes;
- the need to establish data standards across campus (e.g., UBC's research applications information system, RISE);
- the need to combine ethics approvals (e.g., BC Ethics Harmonization Project);
- the Consortia for Advancing Standards in Research Administration Information (CASRAI).

The objective of allowing as much general input and exchange of ideas and information as possible was served by plenary and break-out sessions - the latter focused on the four topics that had been identified with Leaders and SSHRC managers over the course of the summer and fall, as well as on any other topics Leaders felt should be raised. Highlights of the break-out discussions were reported back to a plenary session in the afternoon. The content of the plenary sessions is reflected below, first under the main topics, then under 'other issues'.

Highlights from discussions around the four principal agenda topics

A wide range of issues and practical suggestions were discussed in relation to the four agenda topics, both at the break-out tables and during other plenary sessions during the day. Listed here are some of those issues and suggestions.

Peer review

Breakout topic: "Peer review: how to value and encourage faculty contributions in light of declining participation in the review process?"

Leaders acknowledged the difficulty of finding peer reviewers:

- demographic patterns: there is a decreasing number of senior scholars in universities (they are seen by many as having more time, experience and profile than more junior, pre-tenure colleagues for work as peer reviewers);
- workload: increasing demands on faculty members (teaching, supervision of students, research, dissemination and knowledge mobilization, etc.) and the shared challenges of maintaining a proper work-life balance militate against involvement in peer review;

- bilingualism requirement: experts who do not meet SSHRC language requirements are unable to participate in peer review committees.

Proposed solutions (university lead):

- deans could provide lists of recommended experts from their universities (and notify those faculty on the list);
- incentives could be offered: e.g., St. Mary's University offers a funding pool to peer reviewers for teaching release;
- mentoring: a mentorship strategy could be adopted to make peer review more prestigious and to help newer scholars within each department work towards effective peer review.

Proposed solutions (SSHRC lead):

- make available translations of research proposals, in whole or in part (e.g., an abstract);
- offer incentives: e.g., committee members' institutions could receive block grants specifically allocated for release time to serve on committees and participate in peer review;
- as a condition of receiving SSHRC funding, make it mandatory for grant recipients to provide external assessments;
- make membership on SSHRC peer-review committees mandatory for Canada Research Chairs;
- work more closely with scholarly associations to secure recommendations of reviewers;
- have fewer SSHRC programs: this might require fewer reviewers.

Tri-agency research

Breakout topic: "Inter-agency programming and collaboration: Where are the opportunities from the institutional perspective?"

There was discussion of the need to boost and manage SSH participation in tri-agency or broad interdisciplinary research initiatives (e.g., leadership to engage grand challenges or "big ideas").

There was recognition that SSHRC has the smallest budget of the three federal research-funding agencies, so its contributions to tri-agency programs constitute a substantial investment. By extension, there was some concern that SSHRC contributes funding or invests too much in tri-agency partnerships that may not benefit SSHRC or the SSH community.

On the other hand, there was a call for SSHRC to engage in the sort of broad socio-intellectual and interdisciplinary work reflected in the Integrated History of [People on Earth](http://www.ames.ucar.edu/activities/ihope.shtml) (IHOPE) project (<http://www.ames.ucar.edu/activities/ihope.shtml>). There was a perceived need to break down silos through effective tri-council programs and larger research teams, working on topics such as sustainability/collapse.

Thematic research grants

Breakout topic: "Evolving Federal and SSHRC thematic research priorities: gaps and emerging opportunities?"

- there was some concern that the federal government may be playing too strong a role in setting specific thematic research priorities for SSHRC - with a risk that the topics become not only narrow in scope but 'flavour of the month';

- there was interest in closer university involvement in setting research themes given the fact that most institutions now have their own thematic priorities and strategies;
- there was concern that some research programs are too narrowly focused (e.g., on the STIC sub-priorities¹) and that broader or more loosely defined topics are needed to allow humanities and social science scholars to make a strong contribution. Suggested topics, among others, that would allow a strong SSH contribution: global identities, urban renewal, human rights, good governance, leadership, legal framework, citizenship, democratic engagement, social determinants of well-being, sustainability;
- there was a suggestion to increase the funding period for thematic projects - and, where possible, to provide advance notice for upcoming thematic research themes;
- in order to increase the export capacity of thematic research projects, we should not limit funding to projects that “benefit Canada”: we should broaden the definition to “Canada in a global context” in order to highlight and amplify Canada’s role in the world (policy and public leadership) and to increase the ‘export capacity’ of Canadian research;
- there was a suggestion that SSHRC should contribute strongly to the federal government’s economic stimulus package.

Knowledge mobilization

Breakout topic: “Incentives, support and resources for knowledge mobilization.”

There was strong interest in building capacity/expertise to mobilize SSH knowledge, both at the university level (in relation to the community) and through SSHRC (e.g., in relation to joint initiatives with federal agencies and departments such as CIDA, DFAIT and DND). It was underscored that several federal government departments and agencies have a strong actual or potential stake in SSH research.

A variety of suggestions were made:

- greater use of CBC / Radio Canada as a vehicle for mobilizing SSH knowledge;
- greater use of available information and communication technologies (ICTs) such as Open Access, or through Synergies and the Canadian Research Knowledge Network (CRKN);
- the Canada Research Chairs program is well publicized with decision-makers and might serve as a model for drawing attention to SSHRC;
- lessons may be drawn from the work of Valorisation-Recherche Québec, created in 1999 by the Ministère de la Recherche, Science et Technologie;
- the National Post each month translates articles related to management, business and finance; this could be done with different fields;
- make available one-pagers to condense research results for use by the general public;
- provide lists of experts in different fields to agencies such as CIDA, DFAIT and DND;
- develop expertise in working with provincial agencies;
- develop simpler forms to save time.

Some Leaders intervened to say that Kmb does not necessarily need to be integrated into all research from the beginning of the research process. Furthermore, some mentioned that the expectation to mobilize research should not be directed towards PhD students and younger faculty, who should instead focus on their basic scholarship.

¹ See recommendations of Science, Technology and Innovation Council (STIC): http://www.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/newsroom/news/2008/industry08_e.html

Others placed considerable emphasis on dissemination/KMb from the early stages of research, explaining how research can benefit greatly from early contact with external audiences and their knowledge resources.

There was general recognition, however, that KmB requires extra resources for the SSH community as well as specific expertise. It also requires additional work on the part of SSHRC and federal funding agencies, including further investments in infrastructure and flexibility in design (not a one-size-fits-all approach).

There also appeared to be a general understanding that KmB needs to be managed flexibly - that not all SSHRC programs need to tackle the same KmB objectives, and that not all scholars should attempt to tackle the same KmB objectives.

Other issues raised throughout the day

Humanities scholarship

A number of Leaders expressed their commitment to humanities scholarship and encouraged SSHRC to support humanists and their work. For example, the Research/Creation in the Fine Arts pilot program was seen as a creative way to position the value of SSH approaches that privilege the expression and interpretation of values, meaning, and narratives through text, images, etc.

There was some sense that the humanities are not faring as well as the social sciences (e.g., a sense that text-based work in the humanities is less favoured by peers in Standard Research Grants program) - though it was pointed out that the social sciences have been in the ascendancy over the last 70 or so years.

There was general agreement that one of the most effective ways of promoting humanities research is to focus on the contributions made to Canadian society by students trained in the humanities - and that we need to keep working on securing the evidence of tangible value of this contribution.

While there was evident concern about yielding to pressure to justify research in terms of immediate utility, there was also a strong sense that the relevance of the humanities can be argued on their own terms - by focusing on areas of research such as cognitive systems (philosophy); S&T studies (history); global relations (languages, literature, cultural studies); religious studies; and the creative and media arts.

New or pre-tenure scholars

There was strong interest in gearing SSHRC programming strategies to the fact that a very high proportion of university faculty in the humanities and social sciences are in the early stages of their careers - and, by extension, that a very high proportion of new faculty members are applying to SSHRC programs.

It was noted that many universities link their tenure-track positions directly to success in obtaining major SSHRC research grants.

There was consensus among the Leaders that SSHRC should provide more support to new scholars. There was some concern that in at least one SRG committee, new scholars were not ranked near the top.

There was recognition that collaborative research is much more difficult in terms of managing time and budget and a suggestion that newer faculty should not focus on collaborative grants (and KmB) until they are established.

The overall consensus was that new scholars or pre-tenure scholars are a top priority for both Leaders and SSHRC.

4A category

There was considerable discussion of the “4A” category used by SSHRC to indicate research applications that have been recommended by peer committees for funding, but which SSHRC is unable to fund. Some universities find that the 4A status serves to discourage scholars - notably newer scholars. There was some sense that this is particularly true at smaller institutions whose faculty may receive few or no grants and mainly 4As. However there was also recognition that the 4A category can provide an opportunity for universities to invest in its qualified faculty and to keep more university resources on the SSH ‘side’ of the campus. There was reference to the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) model, in which CFI provides 40% of funding in infrastructure, which then has to be matched by university and other sources.

One idea in play was that SSHRC might offer smaller grants to a larger number of scholars, or shift funds from large granting programs such as Major Collaborative Research Initiatives (MCRI) to a larger number of small research grants. There was some related discussion of the fact that a steadily increasing amount of money has been flowing in recent years into Standard Research Grants (SRG), with funds to MCRI (and thematic and partnership programming generally) remaining fairly constant.

Aboriginal scholarship

Interest was expressed in special fellowship provisions for Aboriginal students similar to the program used by NSERC whereby Aboriginal students do not count against the university’s quota for fellowships.

There was recognition that there are workload issues among Aboriginal Elders, who are used extensively in community-based research (they can feel exploited).

Electronic information systems

There was strong interest in developing the information technology tools that will facilitate management of research applications and investments both at SSHRC and the institutions. As mentioned above, Nancy Gallini, the SSHRC Leader for UBC, provided information on the systems in use by UBC for standardizing research application information (Research Information System-electronic, or RISE).

Small universities

There was concern that smaller universities face steeper problems with issues such as new scholars, the 4A category, and the humanities.

Other issues mentioned

- the need to consult closely, where time permits, on the design of programs (e.g., award amounts for the Vanier Scholarships);
- the need for longer time-frames & longer-term financing in strategic grants;
- the idea of having university research coordinators sit in on SSHRC committees (to assist in preparing applications);
- various ideas around using SSHRC grant funds to leverage external funds (e.g., at Human Resources and Skills Development Canada);
- adoption of a program like NSERC’s Undergraduate Student Research Awards (USRA) program, designed to encourage Bachelor’s students to pursue graduate studies.

Evaluation of the meeting

The immediate objectives for the meeting were defined as follows:

1. to introduce the SSHRC management team to Leaders and to engage in discussion of collaborative efforts to gain mutual understanding of and implement SSHRC's vision, strategic direction and priorities;
2. to give universities the opportunity to provide systematic and direct input into the planning, policies and programs of SSHRC including the environmental scan that will go to Council members in June 2009;
3. to seek Leaders' feedback on topics of interest for future meetings and information sessions.

The Leaders were asked to fill out a questionnaire to provide feedback on the meeting and its success in meeting the above objectives. A total of 19 questionnaires were completed, as the meeting ended slightly early due to the transit strike and winter weather conditions.

The overall assessment of the meeting among those who had an opportunity to respond to the questionnaire, as well as among SSHRC managers, was extremely positive. The main critique from respondents was that more time was needed and that future meetings should be longer.

Several respondents indicated a desire to continue discussions on the topics raised during the meeting, particularly the questions posed during the break-out discussions.

A copy of the detailed responses and a summary table showing overall ratings are attached in Appendix E.

Next steps for the SSHRC Leaders initiative

1. Provide a draft report on the December 12 meeting to *SSHRC Leaders* and SSHRC managers, inviting any additions or changes needed to reflect the content of the meeting;
2. Continue a series of telebriefings on key topics (a briefing on the Networks of Centres of Excellence was provided by Jean-Claude Gavrel on January 27, 2009; and a briefing from Susan Zimmerman is scheduled for February 27, 2009, on the second edition of the Tri-Council policy statement on research ethics);
3. Prioritize areas for attention and develop action plan. Canvass the *SSHRC Leaders* on action plan and agenda for future Leaders meetings and activities, including the possibility of an informal meeting at Congress 2009 in Ottawa.

Appendices

- A. Meeting agenda
- B. List of documents for Leaders meeting
- C. List of participants
- D. Evaluation form
- E. Summary of evaluation responses

APPENDIX A: MEETING AGENDA

<p>Leaders Meeting</p> <p>IDRC Conference Centre Room W. David Hopper (A & B) 150 Kent Street, 8th Floor (between Albert and Slater) Ottawa</p> <p>Friday, December 12, 2008</p>	<p>Réunion des leaders</p> <p>Salle de conférence du CRDI Salon W. David Hopper (A & B) 150, rue Kent, 8^e étage (entre Albert et Slater) Ottawa</p> <p>vendredi, le 12 décembre 2008</p>
<p><i>Objectives:</i></p> <p><i>To introduce the SSHRC management team to Leaders and to engage in discussion of collaborative efforts to gain mutual understanding of and implement SSHRC's vision, strategic direction and priorities</i></p> <p><i>To give universities the opportunity to provide systematic and direct input into the planning, policies and programs of SSHRC including the environmental scan that will go to Council members in June 2009</i></p> <p><i>To seek Leaders' feedback on topics of interest for future meetings and information sessions</i></p>	<p><i>Objectifs :</i></p> <p><i>De présenter l'équipe de gestion du CRSH aux Leaders, de s'aider mutuellement à mieux comprendre la vision, l'orientation stratégique et les priorités du CRSH et d'entreprendre des efforts pour leur mise en œuvre</i></p> <p><i>De fournir aux universités la possibilité de contribuer de façon systématique et directe à la planification, aux politiques et aux programmes du CRSH, y compris à l'analyse environnementale qui sera présentée au membres du conseil en juin 2009</i></p> <p><i>D'obtenir l'opinion des Leaders sur des sujets d'intérêt en vue de réunions futures et de sessions d'informations</i></p>

8:30 a.m./8 h 30 Breakfast / petit déjeuner

Overview of SSHRC Leaders Initiative / Aperçu sur l'initiative des leaders pour le CRSH

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1. | Welcome and role of <i>SSHRC Leaders</i> / Mot de bienvenue et explication du rôle des leaders pour le CRSH | Yasmeen / M ^c Clatchie |
| 2. | Vision and strategic direction for SSHRC: Working with Leaders on quality, connections, impact / Travail effectué par les leaders en matière de qualité, de connexion et d'impact | Gaffield |
| 9:40 a.m. / 9 h 40 | General discussion / Discussion | |
| 10:15 a.m. / 10 h 15 | Health break / pause santé | |

The Evolving Social Sciences and Humanities Research Community and SSHRC Priorities / Évolution de la communauté des chercheurs en sciences humaines et priorités du CRSH

10:30 a.m. / 10 h 30	<u>SSHRC framework for action:</u> Brief presentations by SSHRC VPs followed by Q & A session Chair: Ruby Heap, University of Ottawa <u>Cadre d'intervention du CRSH :</u> Courtes présentations des vice-président(e)s du CRSH suivie d'une période de question Présidente : Ruby Heap, Université d'Ottawa	Charette / Taylor / Yasmeen / Cavallin
11:15 a.m. / 11 h 15	<u>Institutional perspectives:</u> views from the field Brief presentations by panel of <i>SSHRC Leaders</i> focused on the interface between SSHRC priorities and institutions followed by Q & A session Chair: Carmen Charette, Executive Vice-President, SSHRC / <u>Points de vue des établissements :</u> Courtes présentations des groupes de leaders sur les différences entre les priorités du CRSH et celles des établissements suivies d'une période de questions Présidente : Carmen Charette, vice-présidente exécutive du CRSH	Brodeur / Dewitt / Dickinson / Gallini
12:00 p.m. / 12 h 00	Lunch Break / Repas	
1:00 p.m. / 13 h 00	<u>Collaboration in support of social sciences and humanities research - table discussions focused on a few key questions, such as:</u> 1. Peer review: how to value and encourage faculty contributions in light of declining participation in the review process? 2. Inter-agency programming and collaboration: Where are the opportunities from the institutional perspective? 3. Evolving Federal and SSHRC thematic research priorities: gaps and emerging opportunities? 4. Incentives, support and resources for knowledge mobilization / Collaboration au profit de la recherches en sciences humaines <u>Discussions de groupe sur certaines questions clés</u> 1. Évaluation par les pairs - Compte tenu de la diminution de la participation dans le processus de révision, comment inciter la contribution des professeurs et y donner de la valeur? 2. Collaboration et création des programmes inter-conseils : Quelles en sont les avantages pour les établissements? 3. Évolution des priorités de recherche thématique du gouvernement fédéral du CRSH : Quelles lacunes et	McNaughton

nouvelles possibilités en découlent?
4. Motivation, appui et ressources en matière de
mobilisation des connaissances

2:00 p.m. / 14 h 00	Report back to Plenary by one rapporteur from each table Chair: Marilyn A. Taylor, Vice-President, Grants and Fellowships, SSHRC / Compte-rendu des groupes présentés à l'assemblée plénière Présidente : Marilyn A. Taylor, vice-présidente, Direction des subventions et bourses du CRSH	
2:45 p.m. / 14 h 45	Health break / pause santé	
3:00 p.m. / 15 h 00	Final comments from participants and wrap-up / Derniers commentaires des participants et récapitulation	Yasmeen
3:45 p.m. / 15 h 45	Vote of thanks and adjourn / Remerciements et levée de séance	Gaffield

APPENDIX B : LIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR LEADERS MEETING

Front of binder / Pages d'introduction

- Agenda / Ordre du jour
- Directions to *SSHRC Leaders Meeting* / Itinéraire de la réunion des Leaders pour le CRSH
- List of *SSHRC Leaders* and delegates in attendance / Liste des Leaders ou délégués pour le CRSH qui participent à la réunion
- SSHRC participants / Participants du CRSH

Tab 1:

Welcome and role of SSHRC Leaders / Mot de bienvenue et explication du rôle des Leaders pour le CRSH

- Question and Answers for *SSHRC Leaders* / Questions et réponses sur les Leaders pour le CRSH
- *SSHRC Leaders* - Update sent to SSHRC Council (September 23, 2008) / Leaders pour le CRSH - Mise à jour envoyée au Conseil du CRSH (23 septembre 2008)

Tab 2:

Vision and strategic direction for SSHRC: Working with Leaders on quality, connections, impact / Travail effectué par les Leaders en matière de qualité, de connexion et d'impact

- Framing our Direction: Context and Update; Presentation to Council, October 2008 / *Définir nos orientations* : contexte et mise à jour ; Présentation faite à la réunion du Conseil d'administration d'octobre 2008
- *Framing Our Direction (booklet)* / *Définir Nos Orientations (cahier)*
- Dr. Chad Gaffield: Speech to the Canadian Club of Toronto, September 29, 2008

Tab 3:

SSHRC framework for action / Cadre d'intervention du CRSH

Tab 3.1:

Presentation by Carmen Charette, Executive Vice-President / Présentation par Carmen Charette, Vice présidente exécutive

- SSHRC List of Priorities for 2008-2009 / Liste de priorités du CRSH pour 2008-2009
- Reporting on Results and Impacts / Rapport sur les résultats et les impacts
- Budget 2008 Implementation - Canada Excellence Research Chairs / Budget 2008 - Mise en œuvre : Chaires d'excellence en recherche du Canada
- Minister of Industry Accepts S&T Strategy's Sub-Priorities Recommended by the Science, Technology and Innovation Council / Le ministre de l'Industrie accepte les sous-priorités de la stratégie des sciences et de la technologie, recommandées par le Conseil des sciences, de la technologie et de l'innovation

Tab 3.2:

Presentation by Marilyn Taylor, Vice-President Grants and Fellowships / Présentation par Marilyn Taylor, Vice-présidente Subventions et bourses

- Continuous Improvement of Programs Initiative / Initiative d'amélioration continue des programmes

- Blue Ribbon Panel / Groupe d'experts indépendants
- Budget 2008 Implementation - The Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarships (CGS) Program and CGS-Canada Foreign Study Supplement / Budget 2008 - Mise en œuvre : Programme Bourses d'études supérieures du Canada Vanier (BESC Vanier) et Programme de suppléments pour études à l'étranger aux bourses d'études supérieures du Canada

Tab 3.3:

Presentation by Gisèle Yasmeen, Vice-President Partnerships / Présentation par Gisèle Yasmeen, Vice-présidente Partenariats

- SSHRC Partnerships Programs / Programmes de la Direction des partenariats du CRSH
- Partnerships Strategy / Stratégie de partenariats
- Knowledge Mobilization Strategy / Stratégie de mobilisation des connaissances
- Management, Business and Finance Update / Mise à jour sur la gestion, l'administration et les finances
- Budget 2008 Implementation - Research on Environmental Issues and Northern Communities / Budget 2008 - Mise en œuvre : Recherche sur les enjeux environnementaux et les communautés du Nord

Tab 3.4 :

Presentation by Michel Cavallin, Vice-President Common Administrative Services / Présentation par Michel Cavallin, Vice-président Division des finances et de l'administration des octrois

- Progress Report - Business Transformation Initiative / Initiative de transformation des activités
- Update on Business Transformation Initiative and Enterprise Award Management System (EAMS) / Mise à jour sur l'Initiative de transformation des activités et le Système d'entreprise de gestion des octrois (SEGO)

Tab 4:

Additional documentation / Documentations additionnels

- The Economic Role and Influence of the Social Sciences and Humanities: A Conjecture (March 2008) by Ron Freedman (The Impact Group) / Le rôle et l'influence économique des sciences humaines: une conjecture (mars 2008) par Ron Freedman (The Impact Group)

APPENDIX C: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

University / Université	Representative / Représentant
Acadia University	Perrins, Robert
Brandon University	Grills, Scott
Brock University	Chandler, Frances
Carleton University	Osborne, John
Dalhousie University	Ross, Trevor
École Polytechnique de Montréal	Aubertain, Alain
First Nations University of Canada	Farrell-Racette, Sherry
HEC Montréal	Cosset, Jean-Claude
Institut national de la recherche scientifique	Charbonneau, Johanne
Lakehead University	Siddall, Gillian
Lethbridge University	Fiske, Jo-Anne
McGill University	Cooke, Nathalie
Memorial University of Newfoundland	Tremblay, Reeta
Queen's University	Marlin, Susan
Royal Roads University	Taylor, Marilyn
Ryerson University	Boudreau, Jean-Paul
St. Francis Xavier University	McGillivray, Mary
St. Mary's University	Murphy, Terry
Thompson Rivers University	Van Wagoner, Nancy
Trent University	Iannone, Gyles
Trinity Western University	Froment, Elsie
Université de Moncton	Boghen, Andrew
Université de Montréal	Bowen, François
Université de Sherbrooke	Deaudelin, Colette
Université du Québec à Montréal	Brodeur, Monique
Université Laval	Piché, Christiane
University of Alberta	Adamowicz, Vic
University of British Columbia	Gallini, Nancy
University of Calgary	Libben, Gary
University of Guelph	Inwood, Kris
University of Manitoba	Ristock, Janice
University of New Brunswick	Murray, James
University of Northern British Columbia	Fondahl, Gail
University of Ontario Institute of Technology	Campbell, Brian
University of Ottawa	Heap, Ruby
University of Prince Edward Island	Schultz, Katherine
University of Regina	Lavack, Anne
University of Saskatchewan	Dickinson, Harley

University of Toronto	Klausner, David
University of Victoria	Carlin, Claire
University of Western Ontario	Sinai, Dan
University of Winnipeg	Kirby, Sandra
Wilfrid Laurier University	Docherty, David
York University	Dewitt, David

SSHRC PARTICIPANTS / PARTICIPANTS DU CRSH

Name/ Nom	Title/ Titre
GAFFIELD, Chad	President Président
CHARETTE, Carmen	Executive Vice-President Vice-présidente exécutive
CAVALLIN, Michel	Vice-President, Common Administration Services Directorate Vice-président, Services administratifs communs
TAYLOR, Marilyn	Vice-President, Grants and Fellowships Vice-présidente, Subventions et bourses
YASMEEN, Gisèle	Vice-President, Partnerships Vice-présidente, Partenariats

CAMPBELL, Terry	Executive Director, Canada Research Chairs Program Directrice exécutive, Programme des chaires de recherche du Canada
DO, Phat	Chief Audit Executive, Executive Vice-President's Office Chef exécutif de vérification, Bureau du vice-président directeur
DUNNE, Patricia	Director, Research and Dissemination Grants Directrice, Subventions de recherche et de diffusion de la recherche
GAGNON, Murielle	Director, Strategic Programs and Joint Initiatives Directrice, Programmes stratégiques et des initiatives conjointes
GAUDREAU, Véronique	Director, Human Resources Directrice, Ressources humaines
KRCEVINAC, Gordana	Director, Fellowships and Institutional Grants Directrice, Bourses et subventions institutionnelles
LYNN, Trevor	Manager, Communications Gestionnaire, Communications
MACDONALD, Wayne	Director, Corporate Performance and Evaluation Directeur, Rendement organisationnel et évaluation
McNAUGHTON, Craig	Director, Knowledge Mobilization and Program Integration Directeur, Mobilisation des connaissances et intégration des programmes
MOORMAN, David	Senior Policy Advisor, Research Partnerships Programs Conseiller principal en politique, Direction des

	programmes de partenariats de recherche
OSTERRATH, Dominique	Director, Finance and Awards Administration Directrice, Finance et administration des octrois
PAQUETTE, Sylvie	Acting Director, Policy, Planning and International Affairs Directrice par intérim, Politiques, planification et affaires internationales
SQUIRES, Shirley	Director of Corporate Projects, CASD (VP Office) Directrice des projets corporatifs, Bureau du vice-président de la DSAC

TRAUTTMANSDORFF, Christine	Corporate Secretary, Corporate Secretariat Secrétaire générale, Secrétariat du Conseil
TREMBLAY, Hélène	Executive Director, Information Management and Technology Services Directrice exécutive, Gestion de l'information et services de soutien
ZIMMERMAN, Susan	Executive Director, Secretariat on Research Ethics Directrice exécutive, Secrétariat en éthique de la recherche

BERTRAND, Suzanne	Program Assistant, Knowledge Mobilisation and Program Integration Adjointe de programme, Mobilisation des connaissances et Intégration des programmes
BIDAS, Fatima	Program Officer, Research and Dissemination Grants Agente de programme, Subventions de recherche et de diffusion de la recherche
ESAM, Sara	Senior Program Manager, Networks of Centres of Excellence Gestionnaire principale de programme, Réseaux de centres d'excellence
GUNVILLE, Josée	Executive Assistant, Office of the Vice-President Partnerships Adjointe Exécutive, Bureau de la vice-présidente des Partenariats
RUSSWURM, Tim	Executive Assistant, President's Office Adjoint de direction, Bureau du président
WAKEFIELD, Andrew	Program Officer, Knowledge Mobilization and Program Integration Agent de programme, Mobilisation des connaissances et intégration des programmes

FERRANTE, Angela	Member of SSHRC Council Membre du Conseil du CRSH
LU, Mingjun	Member of SSHRC Programs and Quality Committee Membre du Comité sur les programmes et la qualité

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION FORM

In order to evaluate the success of *SSHRC Leaders'* events and to improve the design of similar events in the future, we ask that you please complete the following evaluation form. For each statement, **circle** the number that best corresponds to your point of view. If an item does not apply, **circle** N/A (not applicable).

	Not at all		Entirely			
Objectives						
1. The first meeting objective (as described in the agenda) was met.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2. The second meeting objective (as described in the agenda) was met.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Content						
3. The overall content of the event was relevant to my information needs as the SSHRC Leader for my institution.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Format						
4. The event format was appropriate given the objectives of the event.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5. The event allowed adequate participation by all Leaders.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Duration						
6. The duration of the event was adequate.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7. The time allocated to presentations and general discussion was sufficient.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Location						
8. The location was appropriate given the objectives of the event.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Overall						
9. In general, are you satisfied with this event? What could be done to improve it?	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>					
10. Do you have any suggestions on potential topics or themes for future events?	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>					

11. Any additional comments?

Thank you for your feedback!

APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF EVALUATION RESPONSES

Evaluation Forms Received: 19

QUESTIONS	AVERAGE RESULT
<p>1) The first meeting objective was met: <i>("introduce SSHRC management team to Leaders and to engage in discussion of collaborative efforts to gain mutual understanding of and implement SSHRC's vision, strategic direction and priorities")</i> (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.47
<p>2) The second meeting objective was met: <i>("give universities the opportunity to provide systematic and direct input into the planning, policies and programs of SSHRC including the environmental scan that will go to Council members in June 2009")</i> (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.00
<p>3) The overall content of the event was relevant to my information needs as the SSHRC Leader for my institution (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.18
<p>4) The event format was appropriate given the objectives of the event (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.28
<p>5) The event allowed adequate participation by all Leaders (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.14
<p>6) The duration of the event was adequate (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	3.95
<p>7) The time allocated to presentations and general discussion was sufficient (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	3.95
<p>8) The location was appropriate given the objectives of the event (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.63
<p>9) In general, are you satisfied with this event? What could be done to improve it? (open-ended comments)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longer event • More time for information exchange • More systematic approach to capturing input • use Canada's expertise in group processes! • More time for small group discussions • Need more time for "table talk" • Longer • Yes. SSHRC is approachable and we're in this together 	

- An evening meal would help with networking. Could do a Thursday evening and then meet on a Friday
- I do not see because it was well organized
- Well organized and useful content
- Maybe a more structured round table discussion to maximize (and animate) the 60 minutes
- Yes, although the day was rushed and the panels were very time constrained. The travel challenges limited the amount of discussion and knowledge exchange time
- Yes, a good start. Would like more discussion on issues facing SS&H researchers across the country. More on what SSHRC is planning in next 2-3 years
- More time for discussion on particular topic
- Entry of suggestions with electronic (*illegible*) - posted electronically for wider comment
- Longer - in a 'rush'
- Yes, an excellent and a very promising event
- Excellent day. It was wonderful to meet SSHRC team and Leaders from other universities
- More discussion of what our faculty wants in humanities

**10) Do you have any suggestions on potential topics or themes for future events?
(open-ended comments)**

- Best practices
- Examination of performance data
- Support for undergraduate research. Maybe support for development of resources. Researching faculty are interested in more guidance in this area
- There were at least a dozen points (especially afternoon) which could have used a full day's discussion!!
- The linguistic question (La question linguistique)
- Mobilization and transfer of knowledge - our discussions have only started
- Follow up on ideas presented at this session. Continuation of provision of information about SSHRC successes (quantitative and qualitative)
- Ethics
- Equity and diversity issues in SSHRC funding programs
- Community-based research
- Knowledge mobilization
- Sustainable funding
- Scholarships in SSHRC
- I would very much like to see a discussion of examples of 'evidence' of 'impact' of both social science / humanities research
- I'll get back to you
- Discuss humanities' needs for small - short term grants

11) Any additional comments? (open-ended comments)

- A good start
- The group is TOO big!
- Congratulations to the team at SSHRC! Very professional organization

- Can we establish annual or bi-annual meetings? Excellent day - Thank you!
- The relevance of SS&H to society is well reorganized. With small grants to more people Research Offices can cover additional funds
- Great to have this opportunity - I learned a lot and got some great ideas for improving our institutional operation. Thanks!
- Great team at SSHRC!
- Looking forward to next meeting

Note: An offline discussion with a SSHRC Leader provided some additional feedback: the meeting was too much of a “show and tell” and too high-level - would have preferred a “strategizing” session; concerns about the varying levels of influence within the group; suggestion to leverage the Leaders initiative with institutional resources as much as possible.