Faculty Satisfaction Feedback (2015)
Grant Assist Program, Social Sciences & Humanities
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The Grant Assist Program [GaP] is an initiative of the Office of the Vice-President (Research), begun in 2011 for researchers applying to Canadian Institutes of Health Research [CIHR]. Support specifically targeted for humanities and social sciences faculty members was piloted in the spring of 2013. The goal of the Social Sciences and Humanities Grant Assist Program [SS&H GaP] is to support researchers applying to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and to improve the calibre of grants submitted. The SS&H GaP offers peer mentoring, feedback processes, bridge funding, workshops, information panels, grant editing, research assistants, access to sample successful grants and other resources.

This document summarizes responses to a survey conducted in late August and early September 2015. The purpose of the survey was to evaluate the SS&H GaP as it transitions from pilot to standing program. The survey was sent to 387 continuing faculty members who have had any contact with the SS&H GaP since 2013. 123 responses were received [32% response rate].

Section 1: Awareness of the range of GaP services:
The graph summarizes awareness of SS&H GAP offerings among the respondents.

Figure 1: Awareness of SS&H GAP Offerings
Notes:
• Mentoring: eg. One on one strategy meeting with the GAP’s Senior Coordinator; post-results detailed review of a failed application; detailed written/email correspondence about your proposal.
• Workshops: eg. Altmetrics Research Impact Workshops, CCV-Bees
• Bridge Funding: eg: Partnership LOI preparation grant; GAP 4A bridge funding
• Panel Presentations: eg: Aboriginal Research, Open Access, Research-Creation; Knowledge Mobilization; Lemons to Lemonade
• SSHRC Success Stories - annual event honouring SSHRC researchers, usually held in November
• <sshrcUofA> Listserv for SSHRC Researchers at UAlberta
• GAP Website Resource Centre - tips on grant success, budget-crafting, etc.
• Preferences Polls - re: workshops, retreats, application support needs, etc.
• GAP SS&H document repository in the ERA documents housed in the Libraries’ Education and Research Archive
Section 2: Satisfaction with GaP services

The graphs below summarize satisfaction with SS&H GAP services.

*Figure 2: Satisfaction with GAP Services*

**Legend:**
- a = Dissatisfied
- b = Satisfied
- c = Highly Satisfied
- d = N/A (did not access this)
- e = Did not access this, but think it’s worthwhile
Section 3: Opinions regarding the GaP SS&H key services

- The SS&H GAP should be maintained
- The SS&H GAP should be expanded
- The Research Assistant was helpful
- The Professional Editor improved my proposal
- The Peer Reviewer’s critical feedback made my proposal stronger
- The Senior Coordinator was knowledgeable and supportive
- I will participate in future GAP activities
- I would recommend GAP to my colleagues
- As a Peer Reviewer, I was treated with respect and felt my contribution was valued

Section 4: Narrative Feedback

Respondents were asked to comment on any aspect of the Social Sciences and Humanities’ Grant Assist Program (SS&H GaP). Analysis was performed on 58 narrative comments received from 123 total survey respondents. Bullet points (●) highlight and paraphrase specific comments. The percentage of mention is shown followed by the number of mentions in square brackets. Comments are listed from highest to lowest mention.

- The SS&H GAP Initiative – 22% [13]
  - Great/fantastic and very useful and valuable initiative for the research community.
  - Very satisfied with the services – have contributed positively to my research program including successful applications.
  - SS&H GAP has contributed to the creation of networks and collaboration amongst colleagues.

- SS&H GAP Peer Review Process – 22% [13]
  - Reviewer’s Perspective:
    - Reviewers should not feel pressured to participate and should only be included if they’ve used the program.
    - Occasionally grants were not developed well enough for peer review.
    - Important to encourage applicants to prepare well in advance of deadlines.
    - Membership in the Academy of Reviewers is rewarding.
SS&H GAP Peer Review Process [cont’d]

- Applicant’s Perspective:
  - Important to encourage volunteerism to review amongst faculty.
  - Applications matched to appropriate disciplines give the most effective review.
  - Peer review is very important and helpful.
  - Made changes to my application as a result of peer review.
  - Reviewers have not kept up-to-date on changes and could not comment on new sections.

The SS&H GAP Senior Coordinator – 19% [11]

- Invaluable, personal, detailed, dedicated, sympathetic and effective in her role.
- Provides great advice around increasing visibility of research.
- Ability to connect researchers to one another and disseminate information.
- Knowledgeable about funding opportunities, processes, and social sciences and arts fields.

SS&H GAP workshops/seminars/lectures – 16% [9]

- The workshops are excellent, helpful and contribute to success.
- Workshops focusing on tips and strategies versus explaining rules would be useful.
- The Alt Metrics session and SSHRC visits are useful.

Successful Grants Library – 10% [6]

- Appreciate the grants library and feel it is critical to success.
- More awareness about the grants library is needed.
- Expansion of the database to include more Insight Development Grant proposals.

SS&H GAP Grant Writing Club – 10% [6]

- Too much of a time commitment.
- The writing club was helpful and I appreciated it.

SS&H GAP Editing Service – 10% [6]

- Editing assistance was valuable and important.
- Editing assistance helped me secure funding.
- I would use editing support again.
- The editor was not qualified.

The SS&H Grant Assist Program (GAP) versus the Research Services Office (RSO) – 8.7% [5]

- As RSO is increasingly overloaded, GAP is able to provide supports that may otherwise be missed.
- GAP and RSO provide complementary support - scholarly and administrative, respectively – and both are units are needed.
- RSO, specifically Kerri Calvert and Chelsey Van Weerden, have previously provided positive support for SSHRC applications. Their support is missing and not fulfilled by GAP

SS&H GAP Communications – 8.6% [5]

- Information that is disseminated about SSHRC grants is important as it is not always forwarded by my Department.
- Some information disseminated through listserv is not applicable – too many emails.
- The information is difficult to find.
- The website is useful.
➢ **Timelines of the SS&H GAP Services – 6.9% [4]**
  • Email reminders of grant review well in advance of deadlines to participate would be appreciated.
  • Application reviews could be scheduled outside of times when teaching obligations are heavy.

➢ **SS&H GAP Writers Retreat – 6.9% [4]**
  • The retreat was useful with lots of valuable information.

➢ **Recommendation of the SS&H GAP Services – 5.2% [3]**
  • Recommended by other faculty and to other faculty.

➢ **4A Bridge Funding – 5.2% [3]**
  • The 4A bridge funding was beneficial.
  • The 4A bridge funding could be extended to more researchers based on close scores when success rate at SSHRC are low.
  • Would like 4A funding available more than once.

➢ **Expanding Support of the SS&H GAP – 5.2% [3]**
  • Expand to support beyond the Insight Development Grant (IDG) or Insight Grant (IG).
  • Should be expanded and extended.

➢ **SS&H GAP Outcome Measures – 5.2% [3]**
  • Would be helpful to know if the SS&H GAP services have increased success rate.

➢ **Miscellaneous Comments – mentioned < 2 times**
  • Increased cash support from the University of Alberta would increase competitiveness.
  • Providing clear and simple models for budgets.
  • Faculty should receive more recognition (beyond FEC) for contributions to SS&H GAP.
  • Research Assistant was helpful with CCV.
  • Departments and Faculties could play a great role in supporting writing and submission of grants, particularly innovative and creative SSHRC proposals.
  • SS&H GAP mentorship was key to my success.
  • The Success Stories Event was disappointing – celebrated the success of few versus all those that have been successful.
Section 5
Demographic Information

Respondents were asked to volunteer information as to their main faculty affiliation and duration of employment at the University of Alberta. 91% of the respondents provided their demographic information.

Figure 4: Response by Faculty

Figure 5: Employment (years)