

# NFRF EXPLORATION 2021 INFORMATION SESSION

July 22, 2021



# 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 Review
  - Please send Word documents to [Sharon.Marsh@ubc.ca](mailto:Sharon.Marsh@ubc.ca) by August 5.
- SPARC Full Application Review
  - Please send Word documents to [Sharon.Marsh@ubc.ca](mailto:Sharon.Marsh@ubc.ca) between October 1 and October 14.
  - 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 are supported 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).
  - Resources include 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 relevant and useful.
- Please check the UBC [Vancouver](#) and [Okanagan](#) ORS sites for important 2021 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 share the slides, Q&A chat and recording with attendees, with the recording provided separately at a later date.
- Please enter your questions in the Zoom “Q&A” feature. The chat box will not be monitored.



# Outline

- 2021 Competition Information and Resources
- Eligibility
- NOI
- Full Application Sections and Review Criteria
  - Gender-based Analysis Plus (GBA+)
  - Research Proposal
  - References
  - Team Biographical Information
  - Budget and Budget Justification
  - Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)
- SPARC Support
- Q&A

# 2021 Competition Information and Resources

- The goal of the Exploration stream is to inspire high risk, high reward and interdisciplinary research.
- Exploration stream grants support 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 (for a total amount of \$250,000 over 2 years).

<https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/nfrf-fnfr/exploration/2021/competition-concours-eng.aspx#1>

# 2021 Competition Information and Resources (cont'd)

- [NFRF Exploration homepage](#)
- [NFRF 2021 Exploration Competition homepage](#)
- [NFRF Convergence Portal](#) (requires advance account set-up for NPI, Co-PI and Co-Applicant(s))
- [NFRF 2021 Exploration Applicant and Subject Matter Eligibility](#)
- [NFRF 2021 Exploration NOI Submission Guide](#)
- [NFRF 2021 Exploration Full Application Submission Guide](#)
- [NFRF 2021 Exploration Evaluation Matrices](#)
- [NFRF Best Practices in EDI in Research](#)
- [NFRF 2021 Exploration Instructions for Attachments](#)
- [SSHRC Indigenous Research Statement of Principles](#) and [SSHRC Guidelines for the Merit Review of Indigenous Research](#)
- [Women and Gender Equality Canada's information on GBA+](#) and [CIHR Sex- and Gender-Based Analysis \(SGBA\)](#)
- [Canadian Research and Development Classification](#)
- [NFRF 2021 Exploration Reviewer Manual](#)
- [NFRF 2021 Exploration FAQ](#)

# 2021 Competition Information and Resources (cont'd)

- NOI Deadline: August 10
- Full Application Deadline: October 19
- Check UBC [Vancouver](#) and [Okanagan](#) ORS for NPI and Full Application internal deadlines and requirements.
- Funding Decision: March 31, 2022
- 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 2021.

# 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 2021 NFRF Exploration competition is defined as someone within 5 years from the start date of their 1<sup>st</sup> research-related appointment, minus the length of any eligible delays in research, as of June 1, 2021.
  - Delays include: maternity, bereavement, and medical leave.
  - Delays due to COVID-19 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/excluded reviewers

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

# NOI: Overview (cont'd)

- NOI information and Summary text are automatically transferred over 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; 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 (**new for 2021**).
  - The questionnaire is for administrative purposes and has **no** impact on the proposal 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).
- The Summary 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, Research Grants Officers 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

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

# Full Application Sections and Review Criteria (cont'd)

- 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.

# Full Application Sections and Review Criteria (cont'd)

- If you fail either EDI **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, GBA+ 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.

# 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”.
- Feedback will be given to non-successful applications **if** they were discussed by the multidisciplinary panel.

# GBA+

- 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 GBA+ is incorporated into your research
- If “no”, a 500-character justification text box will appear and you **must** state why GBA+ is not applicable (this text must also **not** contain any identifying information).
- Resources: [Status of Women Canada's information on GBA+](#) and [CIHR Sex- and Gender-Based Analysis \(SGBA\)](#)
- **Note:** GBA+ is an element of the Feasibility criterion, which is why it is addressed in the Research Proposal. Thus, it is **different** from EDI, which is a stand-alone criterion to be described in a separate application section in the Convergence Portal.

GBA+ is assessed by external reviewers **and** the multidisciplinary panel.

# 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.
- With the Exploration stream, 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:
  - High Risk
  - High Reward
  - Interdisciplinarity
  - Objectives
  - Feasibility (including GBA+ 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, such as “our publication”.
  - Be aware that too much preliminary data may diminish “high risk”.

# 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
<b>Unique directions</b>	Develops a completely new theory or paradigms.	Develops a novel concept that bridges established theories in different fields.
<b>Challenging current paradigms</b>	Aims to radically challenge accepted theories or paradigms.	Aims to challenge accepted theories or paradigms.
<b>Enhancing our understanding</b>	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)

<b>Novel interdisciplinary approaches</b>	<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>
<b>Development or adaptation of methods and techniques</b>	<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, cultural, technological or health impact;
- Impacting and/or affecting 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:		
<b>Broad impact</b>	Significant economic, scientific, artistic, cultural, social, technological or health impact.	Notable economic, scientific, artistic, cultural, social, technological or health impact.
<b>Reach</b>	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.
	Will lead to ground-breaking advancements in the area and/or significant advancements in current knowledge, methods and/or technologies.	Will 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 GBA+/SGBA 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
<b>Objectives</b>	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.
<b>Building on current knowledge or prior art</b>	<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)



<b>Work plan</b>	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.
<b>Research team</b>	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.
	GBA+ has been integrated into the methodological approach (if applicable). The impact on the methodological approach and/or design has been clearly described.	GBA+ has 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)

<p><b>Indigenous research*</b></p> <p>Refer to the <a href="#">SSHRC Guidelines for the Merit Review of Indigenous Research</a></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
---	--	--

# 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.

# 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 is 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

	✓ Pass	✗ Fail
<b>Novelty of perspective</b>	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>
<b>Novelty of approach</b>	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.
<b>Project design</b>	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>
<b>Other</b>	-	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 interdisciplinary approach and high-risk nature.	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.

# Team Biographical Information (2 pages)

- This is the **only** section that can identify team members by name. You can also include team members' affiliations in this section.
  - 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.

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

# 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 in the table.

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).

# EDI Criterion (pass/fail)

- **EDI is a core element of the NFRF program.**
- Applicants **must** clearly demonstrate their commitment to EDI 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 the following 3 key areas:
  - Team Composition and Recruitment Processes;
  - Training and Development Opportunities; and
  - Inclusion.

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

**Note:** NFRF will host an EDI webinar on September 16 (time TBD).

# EDI Criterion (cont'd)

- Actions taken are expected to remove barriers and provide opportunities for the meaningful integration of individuals from all groups, **including the 4 designated groups (women, Indigenous peoples, members of visible minorities and persons with disabilities).**
- The focus is on the team's commitment to EDI, **not** its EDI profile.
- **Tip:** Start working on this section ASAP 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 Criterion (cont'd)

- In this section you **can** name UBC and your faculty/department.
- There are multiple EDI 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 1<sup>st</sup> to confirm character counts before pasting completed sections into text boxes.
- Do **not** copy/paste text from the NFRF EDI best practices guide.

# EDI Evaluation Matrix

	✓ Pass	✗ Fail
<b>Analysis of context</b>	<p>Clearly demonstrates understanding of EDI considerations/systemic barriers within the context of the research team.</p> <p>Provides a clear explanation of the team's specific challenges/opportunities related to EDI.</p> <p>Cites examples in the analysis.</p> <p>Demonstrates a strong, broad-based commitment to EDI.</p>	<p>Fails to demonstrate an understanding of EDI considerations/systemic barriers within the context of the research team.</p> <p>Provides an analysis of context that is generic and/or not aligned with best practice and/or that does not point to one or more systemic barriers.</p> <p>Lacks evidence of a commitment to and understanding of EDI overall.</p>
<b>Concrete practice for each area</b>	<p>Clearly identifies, at minimum, one concrete practice specific to the context of the research team for each area.</p>	<p>Does not provide a concrete practice for one or multiple areas, and/or provides concrete practices irrelevant to the context of the research team.</p> <p>Challenges are not discussed.</p>
<b>Implementation</b>	<p>Provides a clear and realistic explanation of how the concrete practice(s) has been/will be implemented.</p> <p>Considers implementation challenges.</p>	<p>Lacks an implementation plan or provides an unclear description of the implementation plan.</p> <p>Provides an unrealistic implementation plan.</p>
<b>Impact</b>	<p>Explains how the concrete practice(s) will impact EDI and describes a suitable methodology for measuring success, including specific evaluation criteria.</p>	<p>Does not explain the anticipated impacts that the concrete practice will have on EDI, nor any method for measuring its success.</p>

# EDI: Analysis of Context (2,500 characters)

- Information about the team's specific circumstances related to EDI, 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 – 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 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 Sections (3 x 250 and 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 their impact.
  - Only discuss the best practices you have listed

# Ideas ... not prescriptive or exhaustive

- Team Composition and Recruitment:
  - Job ads with gender neutral language, advertised broadly
  - Unconscious bias training for interview panels
  - Do not over-rely on institutional offices/policies – be realistic in describing your teams approaches
- Training and Development Opportunities:
  - Mandate team EDI education and training (e.g., [EIO educational programming](#)); provide a formal plan, outlining team training, communication and team building strategies
  - Access to meetings, etc. taking into account people with care-giving responsibilities, daycare runs, etc.
- Inclusion:
  - Offer honest [Land Acknowledgements](#) at meetings/presentations
  - A confidential concerns reporting system with actionable outcomes (e.g., through a formal EDI champion)

# SPARC Support

- SPARC NOI Review
  - Please send Word documents to [Sharon.Marsh@ubc.ca](mailto:Sharon.Marsh@ubc.ca) by August 5.
- SPARC Full Application Review
  - Please send Word documents to [Sharon.Marsh@ubc.ca](mailto:Sharon.Marsh@ubc.ca) between October 1 and October 14.
  - 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 are supported 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).
  - Resources include 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 relevant and useful.
- Please check the UBC [Vancouver](#) and [Okanagan](#) ORS sites for important 2021 competition submission information and internal deadlines.

# Q&A

- Email us with any questions:  
UBC Vancouver: [sharon.marsh@ubc.ca](mailto:sharon.marsh@ubc.ca)  
UBC Okanagan: [denise.maines@ubc.ca](mailto:denise.maines@ubc.ca)
- To ask NFRF competition related questions please email:  
[NFRF-FNFR@chairs-chaire.gc.ca](mailto:NFRF-FNFR@chairs-chaire.gc.ca)
- For technical questions related to the Convergence Portal:  
[websupport@chairs-chaire.gc.ca](mailto:websupport@chairs-chaire.gc.ca)