

NFRF EXPLORATION 2021 INFORMATION SESSION

June 15, 2022



LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

- We begin by acknowledging that UBC's campuses and hospitals are located on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territories of the xwma0-kwafam (Musqueam), Syilx, Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), and Səlílwətał (Tsleil-Waututh) Nations, and that UBC's activities take place on Indigenous lands throughout British Columbia and beyond.



SPARC Support

- SPARC NOI Reviews: Mon., June 20 to 10am on Thurs., June 23
 - Submit Word documents to Sharon.Marsh@ubc.ca.
- SPARC Full Application Reviews: Mon., Aug. 22 to 10am on Thurs., Sep. 8
 - Submit Word documents to Sharon.Marsh@ubc.ca.
 - Applications are reviewed on a first come, first served basis.
 - **Notes:** Reviews are limited to 1 per application. While SPARC feedback is available to all UBC researchers, you may also have access to faculty, department, site or other support. Please work with only one such group to ensure as many researchers receive reviews as possible.
- SPARC Resources
 - Available at <https://sparc.ubc.ca/cwl/nfrf-resources> and <https://vpri.share.ubc.ca/sparc/Pages/NFRF.aspx> (CWL required).
 - Includes SPARC-annotated EDI best practices guide, sample grants, and links to webinar recordings.
 - **Note:** The 2019 application had a different format, consequently the flow of the 2019 sample grants is no longer relevant; however, some sections (e.g., EDI) are still useful.
- Please check the UBC [Vancouver](#) and [Okanagan](#) ORS sites for important 2022 competition submission information and internal deadlines.

HOUSEKEEPING

- This workshop is being recorded and will be available online with CWL access.
 - **Privacy Note:** Attendees are not on video, the participant list is not captured in the recording, and we will verify that no one is identified in the recording.
- We will also share the slides and Q&A chat with attendees.
- Please enter your questions in the Zoom “Q&A” feature. The “Chat” box will not be monitored.



Outline

- 2022 Competition Information
- Eligibility
- NOI
- Full Application Sections and Review Criteria
 - Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in Research Design (EDI-RD; formerly Gender-based Analysis Plus/Sex and Gender-based analysis (GBA+/SGBA))
 - Equity, Diversity and Inclusion in Research Practice (EDI-RP; formerly EDI)
 - Interdisciplinarity
 - High Risk/High Reward
 - Team Biographical Information
 - References
 - Budget and Budget Justification
- SPARC Support
- Q&A

2022 Competition Information

- The goal is to inspire high risk, high reward and interdisciplinary research.
- Exploration stream supports projects that:
 - Bring disciplines together beyond traditional disciplinary or common interdisciplinary approaches;
 - Propose to explore something new, which might fail; and
 - Have the potential for significant impact.
- Funding is for 2 years, a maximum of \$100,000/year + 25% indirect costs (totaling \$250,000 over 2 years).

<https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/nfrf-fnfr/exploration/2022/competition-concours-eng.aspx>

2022 Competition Information

- NOI Deadline: June 28
- Full Application Deadline: September 13
- Check UBC [Vancouver](#) and [Okanagan](#) ORS for NPI and Full Application internal deadlines and requirements.
- Funding Decision: March 31, 2023
- Anticipated Number of Awards: Minimum of 100

Eligibility

- The team must have an NPI and either a Co-PI or at least 1 Co-Applicant.
 - A maximum of 1 Co-PI is allowed, although a Co-PI is not required.
 - The number of Co-Applicants and Collaborators is unlimited (but bear in mind feasibility).
- Trainees can be Collaborators, although **not** if they are supervised by a team member.
- You can **only** be NPI, Co-PI, or Co-Applicant on 1 active NFRF Exploration grant or application at a time (you can be a Collaborator on >1).
 - If on a current NFRF Exploration grant, the final report for this grant **must** be submitted prior to the Full Application deadline of the next grant.
- You cannot apply to other funding opportunities with the same project at the same time.
 - For example, an LOI for NSERC Discovery Horizons cannot also be submitted as an NOI to NFRF Exploration 2022.

Eligibility (cont'd)

- ECR weighting applies. Specifically, the proportion of ECR awards will be equal to the proportion of applications received from ECRs.
 - To qualify as an ECR application, **both** the NPI and Co-PI need to be ECRs. If there is no co-PI, only the NPI needs to be an ECR.
- An ECR in the 2022 NFRF Exploration competition is defined as someone within 5 years from the start date of their 1st research-related appointment, minus the length of any eligible delays in research, as of May 1, 2022.
 - Delays include: maternity, bereavement, and medical leave.
 - Delays due to COVID-19 (e.g., closures) from March 1, 2020 are also eligible.
 - **Delays are counted double** (e.g., a 3-month delay equates to 6-month extension).

NOI: Overview

- **Sections:**

- Team member profiles
- Application title
- Indigenous research checkbox
- [CRDC](#) codes (at least 2 different group-level disciplines)
- Keywords
- 2,500-character Summary
- Suggested reviewers (minimum of three experts from each primary research field)
- Reviewer exclusions

Reminder: The NPI, Co-PI and Co-Applicant(s) must all have a profile on the [Convergence Portal](#).

NOI: Overview (cont'd)

- NOI information and Summary text are automatically transferred to the Full Application in the Convergence Portal.
 - The NPI, title, summary text, keywords, and classification codes **cannot** be modified after the NOI has been submitted.
 - Team members **can** be added/removed/have roles changed after the NOI submission as long as the minimum team requirement is met (changes may require contacting NFRF).
 - Suggested/excluded reviewers **can** be changed in the Full Application.
- The NOI is not competitive; it is used to determine eligibility and to identify potential reviewers.
- If the NOI Summary contains identifying information (e.g., names, institutions), the application could be withdrawn.

NOI: Team Profiles

- When you add a Co-PI or Co-Applicant, they will receive a message to login to the Convergence Portal to complete their required information and confirm eligibility.
- NPI, Co-PI, and Co-Applicants **all** have to fill out an EDI questionnaire when they log into the Convergence Portal.
 - The questionnaire is for administrative purposes and has **no** impact on review.
 - **Tip:** Consider alerting Co-PI and Co-Applicants that every question can be answered with the response 'prefer not to answer'.
- Additionally, the NPI, Co-PI, and Co-Applicants **must** specify 2-5 fields of research and 2-10 keywords.

NOI: Summary (2,500 characters)

- The Summary must contain **no** identifying information (e.g., names, previous work, research groups, departments, institutions, organizations).
- It should contain your objectives/goal and address how the proposal is high risk/high reward/interdisciplinary/feasible.
- Subheadings are a good way to break up the text.
- The 2,500-character limit **includes** spaces and hard returns.

NOI: Submission

- When the NPI submits the NOI in the Convergence Portal, ORS must forward it on your behalf.
 - ORS must check eligibility and then submit the NOI to NFRF.
 - Upon ORS submission, all NOI content is 'locked' and cannot be changed.
- Check UBC [Vancouver](#) and [Okanagan](#) ORS for internal requirements and deadlines.

Full Application Sections and Review Criteria

- Attachments **must** be in size 11 Arial black font, with 3/4" (1.87cm) margins all around, single spaced, and contain page numbers.
- The application identification number (i.e., NFRFx-xxxx-xxxxx) **must** appear at the top of each page of the attachment.
- **No** personally identifying information should be included in the headers and/or footers (e.g., name, PIN, institution).
- The name of the document **must** appear at the top (e.g., Literature References).
- Attachments **must** be uploaded as pdf files.
- **Note: No** additional documents (e.g., CVs, letters of support, appendices) are allowed.

https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/nfrf-fnfr/instructions_attachment-instructions_piece_jointe-eng.aspx

Full Application Sections and Review Criteria (cont'd)

- EDI-RD (formerly GBA+/SGBA) (yes/no; text box justification if “no”; included in Feasibility score)
- EDI-RP (formerly EDI) (**pass/fail**; text boxes provided in the Convergence Portal)
- Research Proposal (4-page attachment, including figures and tables)
 - High Risk (40%)
 - High Reward (40%)
 - Interdisciplinarity (**pass/fail**)
 - Feasibility (20%)
- Team Biographical section (2-page attachment, also included in Feasibility score)
- References (max. 5-page attachment)
- Budget (table in the Convergence Portal)
- Budget Justification (1-page attachment)

Full Application Sections and Review Criteria (cont'd)

- If you fail either EDI-RP **or** Interdisciplinarity, your application will fail.
- All sections **except** the Team Bio need to contain **no** identifying information – any with identifying information will be withdrawn from the competition.

Full Application Sections and Review Criteria (cont'd)

- External reviewers (likely 3), will receive the NOI Summary, EDI-RD text box (if applicable), Research Proposal, References, and Budget Justification.
- They report on 3 criteria: High Risk, High Reward, and Feasibility.
- **All** sections of the NOI and Full Application, **and** the external reviewer reports are reviewed by the multidisciplinary panel (minimum 5 reviewers: 3 expert, 2 non-expert). They score **all** 5 criteria.
- Top rated applications are discussed in a multidisciplinary review committee meeting.

Full Application Sections and Review Criteria (cont'd)

- Scores are assigned according to the corresponding evaluation matrix, with in-between scores also allowed.
 - **Note:** NFRF uses a seven-point rating scale, from “Exceptional” to “Poor”:
 - Exceptional (described)
 - Excellent (between Exceptional and Very Good)
 - Very Good (described)
 - Good (between Very Good and Fair)
 - Fair (described)
 - Inferior (between Fair and Poor)
 - Poor (described)
- Feedback will be given to non-successful applications **if** they were discussed in the multidisciplinary panel review committee meeting.

EDI-RD (formerly GBA+/SGBA)

- Sex and gender as well as many other identifying factors, like race, ethnicity, religion, age, and mental or physical disability **must** be integrated into the research design, when appropriate.
- You **must** answer yes/no to the question of whether EDI-RD is incorporated into your research
- If “no”, a 500-character justification text box will appear and you **must** state why EDI-RD is not applicable (this text must also **not** contain any identifying information).
- Resources: [SSHRC Guide to Addressing Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Considerations in Partnership Grant Applications](#), [NSERC Equity, diversity and inclusion considerations at each stage of the research process](#) and [CIHR Sex- and Gender-Based Analysis \(SGBA\)](#)
- **Note:** EDI-RD is an element of the Feasibility criterion, which is why it is addressed in the Research Proposal. Thus, it is **different** from EDI-RP, which is a stand-alone criterion to be described in a separate application section in the Convergence Portal (to be discussed next).
- EDI-RD is assessed by external reviewers **and** the multidisciplinary panel.

EDI-RP Criterion (pass/fail)

- **EDI-RP is a core element of the NFRF program.**
- Applicants **must** clearly demonstrate their commitment to EDI-RP in their research teams, including students, postdoctoral fellows, Co-PI, Co-Applicants and/or Collaborators, as applicable. They **must** explain what actions they will take, the outcomes expected, and the assessment planned for each of three key areas:
 1. Team Composition and Recruitment Processes;
 2. Training and Development Opportunities; and
 3. Inclusion.

EDI-RP is assessed **only** by the multidisciplinary panel.

EDI-RP Criterion (cont'd)

- Actions taken are expected to remove barriers and provide opportunities for the meaningful integration of individuals from all groups, **including the four designated groups** (women, Indigenous Peoples, members of visible minorities and persons with disabilities). Consideration of other identities, such as LGBTQ2+, is also appropriate.
- An application must **not** include any personal information about members of the research team (including the number of team members belonging to each of the designated groups) in the EDI-RP section; the focus is on the team's commitment to EDI-RP in its research practice, not on the team's EDI profile.
- **Tip:** Start working on this section early to allow time for an environmental scan, and development of appropriate and realistic best practices.
- For more information, see NFRF's [Best Practices in Equity, Diversity and Inclusion in Research](#).

EDI-RP Criterion (cont'd)

- In this section you **can** name UBC and your faculty/department if these are relevant.
- There are multiple EDI-RP text boxes to complete in the Convergence Portal.
 - The portal does **not** allow formatting for emphasis. **Tip:** Use capitals for your section subheadings.
 - Suggest drafting content in Word first to confirm character counts before pasting completed sections into text boxes.
- Do **not** copy/paste text from the NFRF EDI Best Practices guide.

EDI-RP: Analysis of Context (2,500 characters)

- Provide information about the team's specific circumstances related to EDI-RP, including identification of structural biases that could affect members of underrepresented groups.
- Do **not** include numbers of your diverse team.
- Be honest – your field may have challenges with EDI-RP – it is ok to discuss these.
- Be specific – give concrete examples.
- UBC is a member of [Dimensions: EDI Canada](#) and was [selected as 1 of 17 pilot institutions](#).
- Check the [UBC EIO](#) for more information and [useful resources](#) (e.g., faculty diversity and equity reports: <https://academic.ubc.ca/vpa-initiatives/recruiting-supporting-top-faculty-students/faculty-equity-diversity-inclusion>).

Key EDI-RP Sections

(3 x 250 characters; and 3 x 2,500 characters)

- Best practices (250 characters)
 - For each of the 3 sections (Team Composition and Recruitment; Training and Development Opportunities; and Inclusion), state at least 1 best practice.
 - Be realistic, you only have 2 years.
- Relevance, approach, and impact (2,500 characters)
 - Break content into 3 subsections.
 - State the relevance of your best practice(s), how you will implement them, and how you will assess impact.
 - Only discuss the best practices you have listed

EDI-RP Evaluation Matrix

	✓ Pass	✗ Fail
Analysis of context	<p>Shows understanding of EDI-RP considerations / systemic barriers in the context of the research team.</p> <p>Provides a clear explanation of the team's specific challenges/opportunities related to EDI-RP.</p> <p>Cites concrete and specific examples in the analysis.</p> <p>Demonstrates a strong commitment to EDI-RP overall.</p>	<p>Fails to demonstrate an understanding of EDI-RP considerations / systemic barriers in the context of the research team.</p> <p>Analysis of context is generic and/or does not point to one or more systemic barriers.</p> <p>Evidence of commitment to EDI-RP overall is lacking.</p>
Concrete practice for each area	<p>Lists at least one concrete practice that targets the specific context listed for each area.</p>	<p>Fails to list a concrete practice for one or more of the areas, or the concrete practices listed are not related to the context that was described.</p> <p>Challenges are not discussed.</p>
Implementation	<p>Provides a description of how the concrete practice has been or will be realistically implemented.</p> <p>Considers implementation challenges.</p>	<p>Provides no or an unclear description of how the concrete practice will be implemented.</p> <p>The implementation plan is unrealistic.</p>
Impact	<p>Explains how the concrete practice will impact EDI and how it will be measured.</p>	<p>Gives no indication of how the impact will be measured.</p> <p>Fails to explain the anticipated impact of the concrete practice on EDI or how it will be measured.</p>

Ideas ... not prescriptive or exhaustive

- Team Composition and Recruitment:
 - Job ads with gender neutral language, advertised broadly
 - Unconscious bias training for interview panels
 - **Tip:** Do not over-rely on institutional offices/policies – be realistic in describing your team's approaches.
- Training and Development Opportunities:
 - Team EDI education and training with a formal plan, outlining team training, communication and team building strategies
 - Opportunities for trainees to present at conferences, accommodating for financial considerations, including childcare needs.
- Inclusion:
 - Team meetings, etc. scheduled to take into account people with care-giving responsibilities, daycare runs, etc.
 - Confidential concerns reporting system with actionable outcomes, supported by a formal EDI champion

Research Proposal (4 pages)

- Exploration grants support research that pushes boundaries into exciting new areas.
- Researchers are encouraged to think “outside of the box,” undertake research that would defy current paradigms, and bring disciplines together in unexpected ways and from bold, innovative perspectives.
- There is recognition that innovation often carries risk; proposals for high-risk research projects that have the potential to deliver game-changing impacts are strongly encouraged.

Research Proposal (4 pages) (cont'd)

- 4-page limit **includes** figures and tables.
- Address/include (order **not** mandatory):
 - High Risk
 - High Reward
 - Interdisciplinarity
 - Objectives
 - Feasibility (including EDI-RD and/or Indigenous research if appropriate)
 - Methodology and design
 - Work plan and timelines
- Must **not** contain any identifying information.
- Preliminary data is **not** a requirement.
 - If included, it must be carefully worded as it **cannot** include identifying information (e.g., use general terms, such as “our publication”).
 - Be aware that too much preliminary data may diminish “high risk”.

Interdisciplinarity Criterion (pass/fail)

- Applications **must** clearly demonstrate that the proposal integrates approaches from **at least** 2 disciplines that do not traditionally collaborate together, or combines them in a novel way.
- Applications **must** also explain why an interdisciplinary approach is required, and/or the added value this approach brings to the research problem.
- In other words, why is this team assembling to propose this Exploration project at this time, rather than submitting it to an existing Tri-Agency program?

Interdisciplinarity is **only** assessed by the multidisciplinary panel.

Interdisciplinarity Evaluation Matrix

- All applications are assessed for interdisciplinarity and must receive a pass to be considered for funding.

	✓ Pass	✗ Fail
Novelty of perspective	Pushes the boundaries in terms of interdisciplinarity, integrating two or more disciplines that are not commonly combined.	<p>Proposes an interdisciplinary approach where there is a long tradition and/or established co-operation/collaboration/interaction between the disciplines.</p> <p>The project is multidisciplinary. It involves more than one discipline but there is a lack of integration between the different disciplinary perspectives or approaches.</p>
Novelty of approach	Proposes the application or adaptation of frameworks/tools/methods /techniques from one discipline to solve a problem in another discipline. (This can also apply to projects where there is a history of collaboration between the disciplines.)	The proposed frameworks/tools /methods/techniques are already in use in, or easily applied to, the second disciplinary area, requiring little adaptation or development.
Project design	Designed from an interdisciplinary perspective.	<p>The project is an interdisciplinary component "added on" to a more conventional project or program of research.</p> <p>The project is designed from a multidisciplinary perspective, where work in several disciplines will be conducted separately rather than through an integrated approach.</p>
Other	-	The application did not adequately establish the interdisciplinary nature of the project.

Interdisciplinarity Evaluation Matrix (cont'd)

	✓ Pass	✗ Fail
Fit to Program	Proposes a project that pushes the boundaries of what can be funded through the agencies, according to their mandates and existing suites of programs, as a result of its high-risk nature and/or interdisciplinary approach.	The scope of the proposed project (subject and approach) fits within the parameters of the mandate and existing suite of programs of one or more of the agencies.

All applications are assessed for Fit to Program and must receive a pass to be considered for funding.

High Risk Criterion (40%)

High risk can be defined by elements such as, but not limited to:

- Proposing unique directions;
- Challenging current research paradigms;
- Enhancing understanding of complex and challenging issues;
- Bringing new disciplines together with different perspectives, to use novel approaches for solving existing problems; and/or
- Developing or adapting frameworks, methods and techniques.

High risk is assessed by external reviewers **and** the multidisciplinary panel.

High Risk Evaluation Matrix

	Exceptional	Very Good
Unique directions	Develops a completely new theory or paradigms.	Develops a novel concept that bridges established theories in different fields.
Challenging current paradigms	Aims to radically challenge accepted theories or paradigms.	Aims to challenge accepted theories or paradigms.
Enhancing our understanding	Aims to extraordinarily enhance our understanding of a complex and challenging issue and/or significantly enhance our understanding of multiple complex and challenging issues.	Aims to significantly enhance our understanding of a complex and challenging issue and/or notably enhance our understanding of multiple complex and challenging issues.

High Risk Evaluation Matrix (cont'd)

Novel interdisciplinary approaches	<p>Is at the interface between disciplines, requiring a novel interdisciplinary approach (i.e., two or more disciplines that are not commonly combined).</p> <p>Goes beyond established approaches of any single discipline, bringing together disparate disciplines in new ways.</p>	<p>Crosses disciplinary boundaries and integrates approaches from two or more disciplines.</p>
Development or adaptation of methods and techniques	<p>Will develop novel methods or techniques.</p>	<p>Will adapt existing methods or techniques to a new field.</p>

High Reward Criterion (40%)

The potential for high reward balances the risk that projects might fail.

High reward can be defined by elements such as, but not limited to:

- Having an economic, scientific, artistic, ideological, cultural, social, technological, environmental or health impact;
- Having an impact on large communities, or unique communities or subpopulations with the potential to provide lessons for other contexts;
- Transforming and/or disrupting conventional thinking;
- Resolving a longstanding issue or debate; and/or
- Significantly advancing current knowledge, methods and/or technologies.

High reward is assessed by external reviewers and the multidisciplinary panel.

High Reward Evaluation Matrix

	Exceptional	Very Good
If successful, the project is likely to result in:		
Broad impact	Significant economic, scientific, artistic, cultural, social, technological, health or environmental impact.	Notable economic, scientific, artistic, cultural, social, technological, health or environmental impact.
Reach	Strong impact on a single or small number of unique communities or subpopulations, with lessons for other contexts, or strong impact on large or multiple communities.	Impact on a single or small number or unique communities or subpopulations, with lessons for others, or impact on large or multiple communities.
	Significantly impacts numerous fields or applications. Developed techniques/methodology will improve research in all integrated disciplines.	Impacts numerous fields or applications. Developed techniques/methodology will improve research in several integrated disciplines.

High Reward Evaluation Matrix

(cont'd)

Impact on research or the research community	Resolves a long-standing issue, debate or critical question or questions.	Contributes to resolving a long-standing issue, debate or critical question or questions.
	Opens a new area of discovery or changes the direction of thought in a discipline or disciplines.	Identifies a new area for discovery or challenges the direction of thought in a discipline or disciplines.
	Could lead to ground-breaking advancements in the area and/or significant advancements in current knowledge, methods and/or technologies.	Could lead to significant advancements in the area and/or advancements in current knowledge, methods and/or technologies.

Feasibility Criterion (20%)

While a focus on high risk may seem at odds with feasibility, risk must be related to the idea being proposed, and not to lack of a concrete plan or inability to execute activities. Feasibility considers elements such as the:

- Research problem being addressed;
- Knowledge, expertise and capacity of the research team;
- Current research in the field;
- Workplan and timeline;
- Proposed approach, **including EDI-RD** where appropriate;
- Project's engagement and reciprocity with First Nations, Inuit and/or Métis peoples (for Indigenous research), where appropriate; and
- Suitability of the research environment.

Feasibility is assessed by external reviewers (Research Proposal **only**) **and** the multidisciplinary panel (Research Proposal **plus** Team Bio).

Feasibility Evaluation Matrix

	Exceptional	Very Good
Objectives	The proposed research project is clearly presented and its objectives are clearly defined.	The proposed research project is presented adequately and its objectives are sufficiently described.
Building on current knowledge or prior art	<p>The application demonstrates that the research team is aware of current and relevant research and prior art or knowledge.</p> <p>The proposed research may challenge paradigms, but is built on sound principles.</p>	<p>The application demonstrates that the research team is aware of most current and relevant research, and prior art or knowledge.</p> <p>Knowledge of some developments might be lacking, but this does not impact the feasibility of the proposed research.</p>

Feasibility Evaluation Matrix (cont'd)


Scored by multidisciplinary panel
only (Team bio section)



Work plan	The proposed workplan, including methodological approach, is well described, reasonable and likely to be achievable within the proposed time frame.	The proposed work plan, including methodological approach, is described, reasonable and likely to be mostly achievable within the proposed time frame.
Research team	The application clearly demonstrates that the research team has the required expertise in all relevant disciplines to meet the objectives.	The application demonstrates that the research team likely has the required expertise in all relevant disciplines to help meet the objectives.

Feasibility Evaluation Matrix (cont'd)

Mainly scored by multidisciplinary
panel (Team bio section)



Resources	The research team has acquired or has concrete plans to acquire the necessary resources to complete the work. All aspects have been described.	The research team has acquired or has concrete plans to acquire the necessary resources to complete the work. Some aspects have not been well described.
Equity, diversity and inclusion in research design (referred to as GBA+ in previous Exploration competitions)	EDI-RD considerations have been integrated into the methodological approach (if applicable). The impact on the methodological approach and/or design has been clearly described.	EDI-RD considerations have been integrated into the methodological approach (if applicable). The impact on the methodological approach and/or design has been described.

Feasibility Evaluation Matrix (cont'd)

* The overall rating for the Feasibility criterion cannot be higher than the rating of the element in the matrix for EDI-RD and/or Indigenous research. For example, if a reviewer considers most of the elements to be Very Good, but Poor as it relates to either Indigenous research or EDI-RD, then the overall rating for Feasibility cannot be higher than Poor.

Indigenous research* Refer to the SSHRC Guidelines for the Merit Review of Indigenous Research	Co-creation, co-leadership and co-ownership with First Nations, Inuit and/or Métis Peoples are clearly integrated in the project's design. The methodological approach and/or theoretical framework successfully incorporate(s) key considerations of SSHRC's Merit Review of Indigenous Research. Attention to equitable processes and procedures for fair and respectful inclusion of Indigenous communities and their perspectives is evident.	Active engagement and reciprocity with First Nations, Inuit and/or Métis Peoples are present and clearly described. Key considerations of SSHRC's Merit Review of Indigenous Research have been incorporated into the methodological approach and/ or theoretical framework of the project.
--	---	---

Team Biographical Information (2 pages)

- This is the **only** section that can identify team members by name. You can also include team members' affiliations.
 - However, do **not** include other identifying information (gender, race, disability, etc.) **unless** it is directly relevant to the feasibility of the research (e.g., your research plan includes people with lived experience). You **must** have consent from the individuals you are identifying.
- Include an overview of the team's backgrounds and the individual contributions to the project, plus resource details.
- Explain how the team will be coordinated and integrated.

This section is **only** reviewed by the multi-disciplinary panel. It is used along with the Research Proposal section to determine the Feasibility score.

References (max. 5 pages)

- **No** mandated citation/reference format.
- Do **not** highlight team members or trainees in the reference list.

References are made available to external reviewers **and** the multidisciplinary panel.

Budget (table)

- In the Convergence Portal you will be asked to fill out a table with the totals for Years 1 and 2 (neither can exceed \$100K direct costs).
 - 25% indirect costs/year also need to be included.

The budget is assessed by external reviewers **and** the multidisciplinary panel. It must **not** contain any identifying information.

Budget Justification (1 page)

- Justify Year 1 and Year 2 costs.
- Do **not** include any identifying information.
 - **Tip:** Use terms like “Institution 1” and “Trainee 3”.
- You **must** follow the [Tri-agency Guide on Financial Administration](#).
- Although there are no caps on equipment purchases, this is **not** the purpose of NFRF Explorations funds. If you are requesting budget for equipment/infrastructure, ensure this is **very well justified**.
- Indirect costs do **not** need to be justified.
- In-kind contributions, resources, etc. can be mentioned here (but must **not** contain identifying information).

SPARC Support

- SPARC NOI Reviews: Mon., June 20 to 10am on Thurs., June 23
 - Submit Word documents to Sharon.Marsh@ubc.ca.
- SPARC Full Application Reviews: Mon., Aug. 22 to 10am on Thurs., Sep. 8
 - Submit Word documents to Sharon.Marsh@ubc.ca.
 - Applications are reviewed on a first come, first served basis.
 - **Notes:** Reviews are limited to 1 per application. While SPARC feedback is available to all UBC researchers, you may also have access to faculty, department, site or other support. Please work with only one such group to ensure as many researchers receive reviews as possible.
- SPARC Resources
 - Available at <https://sparc.ubc.ca/cwl/nfrf-resources> and <https://vpri.share.ubc.ca/sparc/Pages/NFRF.aspx> (CWL required).
 - Includes SPARC-annotated EDI best practices guide, sample grants, and links to webinar recordings.
 - **Note:** The 2019 application had a different format, consequently the flow of the 2019 sample grants is no longer relevant; however, some sections (e.g., EDI) are still useful.
- Please check the UBC [Vancouver](#) and [Okanagan](#) ORS sites for important 2022 competition submission information and internal deadlines.

Q&A

- Direct your questions at UBC as follows:
UBC Vancouver: sharon.marsh@ubc.ca
UBC Okanagan: denise.maines@ubc.ca
- To ask NFRF competition-related questions, please email:
NFRF-FNFR@chairs-chaires.gc.ca
- For technical questions related to the Convergence Portal, please email:
websupport@chairs-chaires.gc.ca