

SSHRC  CRSH

## **MEETING OF SSHRC LEADERS**

**December 3 to 4, 2009**

Ottawa Marriott Hotel  
Laurier Salon  
100 Kent Street  
Ottawa



Social Sciences and Humanities  
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en  
sciences humaines du Canada

Canada 

## **SUMMARY OF SSHRC LEADERS MEETING, DECEMBER 3-4, 2009**

### **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 61 institutions (see the full list at <http://www.sshrc.ca/site/about-crsh/committees-comites/leaders-eng.aspx>).

### **Annual SSHRC Leaders meeting**

Building on the success of the first major [SSHRC Leaders meeting in December 2008](#), the second major SSHRC Leaders meeting was held in Ottawa on December 3 and 4, 2009. A total of 47 SSHRC Leaders or their delegates attended the two-day meeting. Also attending were Les Monkman (member of SSHRC's governing council and programs and quality committee) and several special invited guests, including: Jac van Beek (vice-president, programs and planning, Canada Foundation for Innovation [CFI]), Margaret McCuaig-Johnston (executive vice-president, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council [NSERC]), Michelle Gagnon (assistant director, partnerships and knowledge translation, Canadian Institutes of Health Research [CIHR]) and Jean-Claude Gavrel (associate vice-president, Networks of Centres of Excellence [NCE]). SSHRC's president and four vice-presidents also attended the meeting, as did various SSHRC directors and a number of program officers.

### **Meeting structure**

Several steps were taken to develop the meeting agenda. The previous annual SSHRC Leaders meeting was discussed with participants at an informal meeting of SSHRC Leaders at Congress at Carleton University on May 27, 2009. During this meeting, Leaders provided feedback on the *SSHRC Leaders Action Plan, 2009-2011*, and on their priorities for the SSHRC Leaders initiative over the coming years. A preliminary draft agenda for the 2009 meeting was developed using the feedback received from Leaders at the meeting at Congress, as well as suggestions provided on the meeting evaluation form from the 2008 annual meeting, and input from SSHRC managers. The draft agenda was sent out to all SSHRC Leaders on September 25, 2009, with an invitation to provide further feedback on topics that should be addressed during the Leaders meeting. A revised agenda was sent to Leaders on November 10, 2009, identifying the three main objectives of the meeting:

1. to review and update the *SSHRC Leaders Action Plan, 2009-2011*;
2. to engage Leaders on key recent developments at SSHRC, including SSHRC's program architecture renewal and peer/merit review processes; and
3. to promote funding opportunities for social sciences and humanities research in other federal programs and agencies (CFI, CIHR, NCE, etc.).

### **Summary of main topics**

#### **Day one: SSHRC's program architecture renewal**

SSHRC is renewing its program architecture to create a more flexible and effective system of application and assessment. This exercise is in keeping with commitments to continuously improve SSHRC programs, as stated in *Framing Our Direction*, and will result in greater overall program coherence, with an improved and simplified interface for SSHRC applicants.

Prior to the annual meeting, a tele-briefing was held with a small group of Leaders to present SSHRC's program architecture renewal and to review the documentation before sending it to all Leaders. The feedback received from this small sample group helped shape the introduction of SSHRC's program architecture renewal to the Leaders by Gisèle Yasmeen, vice-president, partnerships, and Brent Herbert-Copley, vice-president, grants and fellowships. The introduction focused on explaining the new program design, and provided an opportunity for SSHRC Leaders to ask questions on the overall proposal, the continuation of specific programs, the new "partnerships and alliances" funding mechanism, adjudication practices, and knowledge mobilization.

During the open session, Leaders' questions focused on the program design summary chart that was circulated to Leaders prior to the meeting, as well as on its implementation. Some of the highlights of this discussion are as follows:

- Leaders were enthusiastic about a number of the new elements proposed for SSHRC's program architecture renewal. However, further explanation of some of the mechanisms and definitions of terms would be needed prior to its implementation and circulation to the institutions, including information on where to find existing programs.
- Leaders were unclear as to how the SSHRC budget will be allocated in light of the program architecture renewal. Will future budgets focus more heavily on the new integrated partnership opportunities, and will there still be room for individual research? This would need to be clearly explained when the new program architecture is rolled out.
- Leaders expressed concern regarding the future of the Aid to Small Universities (ASU) and SSHRC Institutional Grants (SIG) programs within the new architecture. Both small- and medium-sized universities rely heavily on these programs and want to be assured that the important role this support plays will be considered within the new program architecture.
- SSHRC should produce a transitional tool explaining the new program architecture to the research community well before (e.g., six months) the transition takes place. Research offices especially need sufficient notice to incorporate these changes into their operations.
- Certain definitions were unclear based on the documentation provided, including:
  - How does SSHRC define knowledge mobilization (KMb)? It appears to encompass knowledge translation, knowledge transfer, knowledge exchange, etc. How does KmB differ from traditional dissemination? Is KmB now required in all SSHRC-funded projects? How will KmB be adjudicated?
  - How will partnerships be defined? Will it be possible to partner with researchers/institutions outside of Canada?
  - What will the application forms look like, and will there be one generic form for all SSHRC programs? In the future, will it be possible to submit one application in order to apply to multiple programs simultaneously?
  - Regarding adjudication criteria: With the new system, how will projects be adjudicated? What kind of workload will be placed on future committee members? How will KmB be adjudicated, and will it be a required element of all future SSHRC-funded projects?
  - Questions were raised by some Leaders about the treatment of interdisciplinary research under the new program architecture, and SSHRC's plans regarding the future of Committee 15 (Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Studies) in the Standard Research Grants program.

In the afternoon of day one, Leaders were given the opportunity to participate in two breakout sessions, the first of which focused on SSHRC's program architecture renewal. Leaders were asked to join one of four breakout groups. The topics to be discussed by each breakout group related directly to the three umbrella programs and the new partnerships funding mechanism offered under SSHRC's renewed program architecture. (Note: At the time of the SSHRC Leaders meeting, the umbrella programs and funding opportunities were not yet branded. The programs received their official names [Insight, Connection and Talent] in January 2010.)

The topics for the breakout groups were:

- building knowledge and understanding (the Insight umbrella program);
- mobilizing knowledge (the Connection umbrella program);
- developing talent (the Talent umbrella program); and
- partnerships and alliances (partnership funding opportunities available under both the Connection and Insight umbrella programs).

Each breakout group was asked to select a chair to report back to the plenary session on the main observations or proposals produced by each discussion.

Each group, as a rule, had at least one SSHRC manager or senior staff member present to serve as a resource person.

Each group also had a SSHRC staff member present to serve as note-taker. The notes were to focus on the important ideas and information provided, with a view to strengthening the meeting report.

#### **Highlights from breakout sessions**

##### *Building knowledge and understanding (Insight umbrella program)*

- Leaders were enthusiastic about the new proposal, and encouraged SSHRC to present it to its stakeholders in a very clear and concise way. The announcement should be extremely positive and highlight the new opportunities as well as the simplified process of the program architecture.
- In order to provide clarity within the social sciences and humanities research community, there is a need for a flowchart that clearly indicates where existing programs can be found in the new system.
- Looking at all of the initiatives, Leaders would like more clarity on how the budget will be allocated.
- There were questions and concerns regarding adjudication and the definition of “research excellence” in the new program architecture:
  - Assessment criteria need to be simplified as opposed to the way it is right now. Leaders would like a clearer definition of what constitutes research excellence.
  - Participation in adjudication committees and external assessments should be explicitly recognized by SSHRC and the institutions.
  - More clarity is needed regarding the inclusion of knowledge mobilization within the Insight umbrella program: Are all researchers required to incorporate Kmb? What is the difference between Kmb and “traditional” methods of dissemination?
- Leaders encouraged SSHRC to consult with the universities and other stakeholders prior to implementing the program architecture renewal. If SSHRC is going to call for feedback, it should be a meaningful exchange.

*Mobilizing knowledge* (Connection umbrella program)

- Leaders would like a clearer definition of knowledge mobilization and its purpose—and, in particular, answers to the question of audience (“Who should the knowledge be mobilized to?”). For example:
  - KMb can be defined as how academics share information with other academics, but also with government, policy-makers, the public at large, etc.; or
  - KMb at SSHRC should focus on reaching non-academics, and this should be the focus of programs within the KMb (or Connection) umbrella program, whereas KMb to academics should remain part of “traditional” dissemination.
- Leaders expressed the challenges of KMb for both the institutions and the granting councils. The tools of KMb are continually changing (e.g., social media) and, as a result, the means and methods of how questions are being asked and answered is continually changing, rendering it difficult to “keep up.” The institutions require new staff to better understand KMb, and this is proving particularly difficult at some of the smaller institutions.
- Some programs will be difficult to place (e.g., CURA) because they fit everywhere. It is not clear which existing programs will fit into the KMb (or Connection) umbrella program, and it will therefore be necessary to provide a clear definition of KMb in order for researchers and research offices to know where to apply.
- Scholars don’t always have the skills required for KMb, and require more clarity on what it is.
- Leaders expressed the belief that SSHRC could do more for open access funding. Researchers need to better understand what it is and what it is about.

*Developing talent* (Talent umbrella program)

- Leaders focused a considerable amount of time on discussing postdoctoral researchers. Issues raised were:
  - Access to maternity and parental leave, taxation, salaries and funds (at present these vary by institution, and, in some cases, by faculty);
  - The role of the Canadian Association for Graduate Studies in support on these issues, in particular maternity and parental leave; and
  - The need, stressed by the Leaders, for the three funding agencies to come to a harmonized policy on these issues.
- Issues regarding undergraduate student preparation were also discussed:
  - Leaders expressed the need to bring undergraduate students into the social sciences and humanities culture sooner, and are encouraging SSHRC to take more of a lead role in this.
  - It is perceived that graduate students in natural sciences and engineering are more familiar with NSERC than their social sciences and humanities counterparts are with SSHRC when commencing their graduate studies.
  - SSHRC is encouraged to explore funding for undergraduate students to increase the visibility of SSHRC.
  - Programming could include more opportunities to support undergraduate students.

*Partnerships and alliances* (partnership funding opportunities)

- Leaders found the new integrated partnerships funding opportunities to be very creative/innovative, and are excited about the new opportunities that it presents.
- A lot of thinking is still left to be done around the definitions of formal “partnership” and “range,” as well as the leveraging. Future applicants will have to be convinced that their applications will be taken seriously, regardless of size (e.g., that the \$20,000 partnering project still has a fair chance of receiving funding).
- Adjudication needs to be thought through very carefully. There has to be both clarity and transparency in terms of criteria: How will projects be evaluated (e.g., based on excellence, theme, balanced portfolio)? Adjudication criteria for the new partnerships and alliances mechanism will need to be clearly outlined to applicants.
- Be up front about the amount of money in all areas of the program architecture—need to see the whole pie.
- Do not want to infringe on scholars doing small projects, but do not want to hinder the big projects either.

**Breakout session on key policy questions related to SSHRC’s program architecture renewal**

The next breakout session focused on key policy questions related to SSHRC’s program architecture renewal. Leaders were asked to discuss one of the following five topics:

- new/untentured scholars;
- international collaboration;
- capturing outcomes and impacts at the institutional and program level;
- peer review and adjudication processes; or
- Aboriginal research.

**Highlights from breakout sessions**

*New/untentured scholars*

- Leaders stressed the importance for new scholars of receiving a SSHRC grant; SSHRC grants are seen as a stamp of approval that often leads to additional funding in the future.
- To the institutions, new scholars appear more competitive—they are seeing more and more new scholars who have completed multiple postdoctoral fellowships. However, new scholars remain underfunded in SSHRC competitions.
- There was strong belief among Leaders that a separate envelope should be provided for new scholars in certain programs (e.g., Research Grants, Research Development Grants). Several proposals for a “new scholars” competition were provided, including smaller grants, shorter time periods, etc. The program architecture renewal team is strongly encouraged to examine the existing programs at Fonds de recherche sur la société et la culture for new scholars.
- Care should be taken to provide new scholars with more information in the committee comments, to help new scholars restructure their proposals.

*International collaboration*

- Leaders recognized the importance of international experience for doctoral students. SSHRC allowing doctoral fellowships to be used to study and travel abroad for research was seen as a step in the right direction.
- Leaders emphasized the need for SSHRC to recognize the difference between internationalization and international collaboration.

- SSHRC should follow the lead of some foreign granting agencies and allow international co-investigators.
- International collaboration should be available across all of SSHRC's programs, but care must be taken to not make it a requirement.
- Leaders recommended that a fund be created under the new program architecture to address timely issues that may arise (e.g., governance in Afghanistan).
- One of the major issues raised against furthering international collaboration involved the ethical issues and barriers that could be raised. For example, when working collaboratively with someone in another country, particularly in the developing world, it is difficult to emphasize that the funds are meant for research and not funding aid.

#### *Capturing outcomes and impacts at the institutional and program level*

- Leaders acknowledged that there is a growing recognition at the institutional level of the need to capture and record research impacts. However, institutionally, there is a lack of means to collect research outcomes.
- Universities are not equipped to capture systematically what social sciences and humanities funding does. It remains unclear how best to measure the outcomes and impacts of social sciences and humanities research.
- The lack of a coherent means to measure outcomes and impacts has led to some push-back and distrust of attempts to capture and record outcomes and impacts. It appears that, with fewer research funds available, there will be a shift towards greater output and accountability. Outcomes are becoming increasingly important, but the means to measure them remain unclear.

#### *Peer review and adjudication processes*

- Leaders provided a number of recommendations regarding the process of recruiting committee members and the composition of the committees:
  - Leaders applauded the effort by SSHRC to include researchers from smaller institutions, but some now fear that the smaller institutions may be overrepresented on the committees.
  - There is a lot of mystery surrounding how committee members are recruited, and some feel that the universities are being bypassed in the selection process. SSHRC is encouraged to contact the vice-presidents of academics on campus for support in recruiting new committee members.
  - The bilingual requirement for committee members was widely discussed. It was suggested that it is a disadvantage to some regions of the country, and the suggestion was made to provide translation during the discussions in order to make the meetings more inclusive. SSHRC should focus on finding the “top scholars” to serve on committees, and not just the “top bilingual scholars.” However, Leaders agreed that the committee chair should be fully bilingual.
- The inner workings of committees, and the adjudication process in general, remains a mystery on most campuses. Leaders recommended expanding the observer program to include research services, thus allowing them to go back to their institutions to better inform their researchers and help them prepare their applications.
- Leaders provided several recommendations regarding the “4A category”<sup>1</sup> and how to assist scholars in this category:

---

1. This category refers to applications that are recommended but for which no funding is available. When additional funds become available in a given fiscal year, they are distributed among 4A candidates according to ranking.

- Leaders suggested that more focus be placed on comments for 4As to help these scholars rework their applications for future competitions.
- Program officers are encouraged to recruit committee members from the 4A list; their participation on the committee would help them better understand the peer review/adjudication process, which will help them with future applications.
- As per the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Panel, Leaders made a number of recommendations with regard to the process of finding external assessors:
  - SSHRC was encouraged to create a college of experts—a list of potential peer reviewers (as recommended by the Blue Ribbon Panel). The college of experts should be composed of scholars who agree in principle to provide assessments. As a result, requests to provide an assessment will be expected, allowing scholars time to plan ahead and reserve time in case they are contacted. Deans and the vice-presidents of academics can be relied on to help build the list of experts.
  - There was some discussion of the value of the external assessments. The suggestion was made to seek external assessments only in cases where there is not sufficient expertise on the committee.
  - External assessors may require better instruction on the adjudication process and how their assessments will be used, prior to agreeing to provide an assessment.
- Leaders expressed concern that there is no incentive to provide an external assessment or serve on a committee. Peer reviewers should receive a greater profile to illustrate their commitment to SSHRC's peer review process.
- There was some debate among Leaders concerning the recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Panel that more emphasis should be placed on the quality of proposal over the academic record of the scholar (whether SSHRC should move away from the 60/40 weighting that is currently employed for Standard Research Grants).<sup>2</sup>
- Some Leaders expressed concern over the recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Panel to dissolve the Standard Research Grants Committee 15 (Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Studies), indicating that interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary research could be at a disadvantage if the researcher is asked to select one discipline under which to apply.

#### *Aboriginal research*

- Leaders approved of the pilot initiative on Aboriginal research, and encouraged SSHRC to continue and expand this approach. In particular, Leaders liked the set-up of a meaningful and respectful partnership between academics and First Nations, Métis and Inuit communities.
- Leaders approved of the partnering aspects of the pilot program, in particular the idea that the projects be equally composed of 50 per cent elders and 50 per cent scholars.
- The Aboriginal Research Pilot Program has played an important role in terms of promoting respect for Aboriginal research in different institutions.

---

2. In the Standard Research Grants program, the overall score of an application submitted by a regular scholar is weighted as follows: the record of achievement is worth 60 per cent of the total score, and the program of research is worth 40 per cent. The opposite weighting is used for new scholars.



- Leaders believe Aboriginal initiatives should have a prominent place throughout SSHRC's program architecture, and encourage SSHRC to examine international models of Aboriginal research while finalizing the program architecture renewal.
- SSHRC is also encouraged to examine the opportunities for mentorship of Aboriginal scholars. While there is existing support at the graduate student level, SSHRC is encouraged to examine the possibility of support for undergraduates.
- Leaders would like to see more than one entry point in a year for Aboriginal research.

#### **Day two: Inter-agency programming and collaboration**

Day two of the SSHRC Leaders meeting focused primarily on inter-agency programming and collaboration. Representatives from the CFI, CIHR and NSERC were invited to participate in a plenary discussion. Associate Vice-President of the Networks of Centres of Excellence Jean-Claude Gavrel was also present to respond to Leaders' questions. In addition to serving as an information session for Leaders and an opportunity to provide direct feedback to SSHRC and its sister agencies, the inter-agency sessions also yielded valuable recommendations on how to increase the participation of social sciences and humanities researchers in programs offered by the agencies. Some of the suggestions were as follows:

- Leaders would like to see a greater harmonization of the application process between the tri-agencies. At present, there are several perceived barriers to moving from one agency to another that render it difficult to fund multidisciplinary or multisector partnerships. Researchers are normally familiar with only one of the agency's application forms, programs and methods of adjudication. Any means to simplify cross-sector collaboration would be greatly beneficial (e.g., the Canadian Common CV).
- On some campuses and in some research offices, inter-agency programs are perceived as being for researchers outside of the social sciences and humanities community. A guidebook to all of the inter-agency programs and collaborations, circulated on campus, would be greatly beneficial to explain the different programs and share sector-specific success stories to illustrate existing possibilities to researchers.

Following the panel presentations and the Q&A session, Leaders were given the opportunity to participate in a breakout group on one of the following topics:

- Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI)
- Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR)
- Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC)
- Inter-agency programming (e.g., NCE, Canada Research Chairs, Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarships, Canada Excellence Research Chairs, the Indirect Costs Program)

During the breakout sessions, Leaders were asked to focus on the following questions and to report the main points from their discussion during the plenary session that followed:

1. Which actions can be taken to improve and/or facilitate social science and humanities participation in these programs (CFI, CIHR, NSERC or inter-agency programs)?
2. What are the strategic and operational issues that need to be addressed to facilitate progress?

## Highlights from the breakout sessions

### *Canada Foundation for Innovation*

- Leaders indicated that there is a cultural barrier within the scholarly community: CFI is not seen to be open to the social sciences and humanities community; therefore, more work needs to be done within the faculties to encourage more applications to CFI programs.
- Leaders encouraged CFI to be more transparent: information needs to be more easily accessible. On the other hand, the universities need to encourage their social sciences and humanities researchers to seek out more information about CFI programming.
- Leaders suggested that the definition of data used by CFI needs to be changed to make it more inclusive for social sciences and humanities research. In particular, infrastructure requirements for social sciences and humanities research differ greatly from the health or natural science fields; therefore, a broader definition of infrastructure is also needed.
- Leaders wish to see a targeted social sciences and humanities envelope so that CFI projects do not engage only multidisciplinary initiatives.
- Leaders indicated that there is a need to increase the involvement of social sciences and humanities researchers in CFI programming. This is an area in which the universities can play a big role by partnering with CFI from the beginning.

### *Canadian Institutes of Health Research*

- Leaders noted that researchers are still unclear on where they should go with funding applications on health. Thirty-one applicants with health-related projects were declared ineligible by SSHRC. It was recommended that SSHRC should track those applicants to see how they fare at CIHR, if they apply. The major concern is not whether social sciences and humanities researchers are eligible at CIHR, but whether they are being funded.
- Leaders noted that social sciences and humanities researchers on CIHR committees tend to give lower scores to social sciences and humanities applications. This may be reflective of the social sciences and humanities community's culture, or of the need for a stronger voice on CIHR committees. Leaders recommend holding information workshops for review panels at CIHR about the social sciences and humanities community's culture. Likewise, workshops should also be held for social sciences and humanities members sitting on CIHR committees regarding the different adjudication culture at CIHR.
- Leaders who have served on CIHR committees have noted that qualitative research does not fare as well. Collaborating with medical researchers may increase the chance of receiving funding.
- Leaders expressed the need for greater communication, transparency and guidance for applicants. Social sciences and humanities researchers need to learn the skill sets necessary to successfully apply at CIHR. It is an education issue.

### *Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council*

- Leaders expressed concerns over applications that go to SSHRC but don't quite fit and, as a result, get moved around between committees. This is of particular concern regarding management, business and finance projects that take a more statistical approach and would be better suited to NSERC.
- Leaders suggested developing a process or a program for projects that take a multidisciplinary or multisector approach across the agencies. Leaders would like the

tri-agencies to work together to think about partnership projects that encompass elements from all three agencies.

*Inter-agency programming*

- Leaders encouraged SSHRC and its partners to develop a guidebook to all of the inter-agency collaborations. The guidebook could be circulated to research offices as well as within the faculties of arts, humanities and social sciences. It could provide background information on the origins of the programs and an explanation of how inter-agency collaboration works.
- Leaders encouraged SSHRC and its partners to publish success stories of social sciences and humanities researchers from the various inter-agency programs. These stories could be used to illustrate that there is a place for social sciences and humanities research in the various programs, and would give the community the sense that they have a place within these programs.
- Leaders encouraged SSHRC to continue its work to maintain a more open definition of “commercialization” in the various inter-agency collaborations and programs. Commercialization is not always defined the same way, and is sometimes interpreted as a liaison or partnership.
- There is a need to reinterpret the federal government’s Science and Technology Strategy—to have people as an integral part of the “widget” picture.

**Day two: SSHRC Leaders Action Plan, 2009-2011**

The meeting concluded with a discussion of the SSHRC Leaders initiative and the action plan that was developed for 2009-11. Rather than separate into breakout groups, Leaders decided it would be more beneficial to hold an extended, open plenary session. Using this forum, Leaders shared some of their experiences and best practices in their role as Leader on their campus. Leaders also compared their activities and roles with those of their on-campus counterparts from the other agencies (the CIHR delegates and NSERC ambassadors). The discussion concluded with an overall evaluation of the SSHRC Leaders initiative, as well as of this year’s annual meeting. Some suggestions were provided on how to improve the initiative and the meetings in general:

- Leaders suggested that a half-day orientation session be offered to new Leaders prior to the annual meeting to give them an overview of their role as SSHRC Leader and bring them up to speed on the activities of SSHRC Leaders to date and the major topics that will be covered during the annual meeting.
- Leaders appreciated the new two-day format of the meeting: more topics were covered and there was more time for informal conversation with SSHRC staff, as well as for networking among Leaders.
- Leaders enjoyed the additional breakout sessions; however, there were too many “good” options, which made it difficult to choose which session to attend. Leaders would appreciate a summary from each of the tables to help stimulate further discussion amongst Leaders and on campus. In addition, Leaders wish to continue discussions on the topics raised during the two-day meeting. In particular, they wished to discuss certain aspects of the program architecture renewal in greater detail, such as new/untentured scholars, adjudication processes and knowledge mobilization.

## Next Steps

- Circulation of the full meeting report and the revised action plan to all Leaders and SSHRC participants for their feedback, followed by revision of both documents.
- Regional SSHRC Leaders meetings or teleconferences to discuss SSHRC's program architecture renewal in further detail. Six meetings or teleconferences will be held in order to provide all Leaders with the opportunity to participate.
- Informal meeting of SSHRC Leaders at Congress 2010 at Concordia University in Montréal, June 2, 2010 (proposed date).
- Next annual SSHRC Leaders meeting, December 2 and 3, 2010 (proposed date).

## Appendixes

- 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

SSHRC LEADERS MEETING	RÉUNION DES LEADERS POUR LE CRSH
Agenda	Ordre du jour
<p><b>Thursday, December 3, 2009</b></p> <p>Laurier Salon Marriott Hotel 100 Kent Street, Ottawa</p> <p><b>Meeting objectives</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To review and update the SSHRC Leaders Action Plan, 2009-2011</li> <li>2. To engage Leaders on key recent developments at SSHRC including SSHRC's program architecture renewal and peer/merit review processes</li> <li>3. To promote funding opportunities for social sciences and humanities research in other federal programs and agencies (CFI, CIHR, NSERC, etc.)</li> </ol> <p><b>8:30 am</b></p> <p>Breakfast</p>	<p><b>Jeudi 3 décembre 2009</b></p> <p>Salon Laurier Hôtel Marriott 100, rue Kent, Ottawa</p> <p><b>Objectifs de la réunion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revoir et actualiser le plan d'action de 2009-2011 des leaders pour le CRSH.</li> <li>2. Discuter avec les leaders des principaux développements récents du CRSH, y compris le renouvellement de l'architecture des programmes du CRSH et les processus d'évaluation selon le mérite et par les pairs.</li> <li>3. Promouvoir des possibilités de financement pour la recherche en sciences humaines dans d'autres programmes et organismes fédéraux (Fondation canadienne pour l'innovation [FCI], Instituts de recherche en santé du Canada [IRSC], Conseil de recherches en sciences naturelles et en génie [CRSNG], etc.).</li> </ol> <p><b>8 h 30</b></p> <p>Déjeuner</p>
<p><b>WELCOME AND OVERVIEW OF AGENDA</b></p>	<p><b>MOT DE BIENVENUE ET APERÇU DE L'ORDRE DU JOUR</b></p>
<p><b>9:00 am</b></p>	<p><b>9 h</b></p>

Review of SSHRC Leaders  
accomplishments to date  
*Craig McNaughton*

Sommaire des accomplissements des  
leaders pour le CRSH  
*Craig McNaughton*

**WELCOME FROM THE PRESIDENT  
AND STRATEGIC OVERVIEW OF  
SSHRC**

**MOT DE BIENVENUE DU PRÉSIDENT ET  
APERÇU STRATÉGIQUE DU CRSH**

**9:15 am**

**9 h 15**

A conversation with the president  
*Chad Gaffield*

**1**  
Document

Une conversation avec le président  
*Chad Gaffield*

**SSHRC'S PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE  
RENEWAL AND PEER REVIEW  
PROCESSES**

**RENOUVELLEMENT DE  
L'ARCHITECTURE DES PROGRAMMES  
DU CRSH ET PROCESSUS  
D'ÉVALUATION PAR LES PAIRS**

**10:00 am**

**10 h**

*Gisèle Yasmeen*  
*Brent Herbert-Copley*

**2 & 3**  
Documents

*Gisèle Yasmeen*  
*Brent Herbert-Copley*

**10:45 am**

**10 h 45**

**Break**  
*15 minutes*

**Pause**  
*15 minutes*

**SSHRC'S PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE  
RENEWAL AND PEER REVIEW  
PROCESSES**

**RENOUVELLEMENT DE  
L'ARCHITECTURE DES PROGRAMMES  
DU CRSH ET PROCESSUS  
D'ÉVALUATION PAR LES PAIRS**

**11:00 am**

**11 h**

Questions and discussion - plenary  
session

Questions et discussion : séance plénière

**12:15 pm**

**12 h 15**

**Lunch**  
*1 Hour*

**Dîner**  
*1 heure*

<p><b>WORKING GROUPS ON SSHRC'S PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE RENEWAL</b></p>		<p><b>GROUPES DE TRAVAIL SUR LE RENOUELEMENT DE L'ARCHITECTURE DES PROGRAMMES DU CRSH</b></p>
<p><b>1:15 pm</b></p>		<p><b>13 h 15</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short introduction by Gisèle Yasmeen</li> <li>• Breakout table discussions on key features of SSHRC's renewed program architecture:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Building knowledge and understanding</li> <li>➤ Mobilizing knowledge</li> <li>➤ Developing talent</li> <li>➤ Partnerships and alliances</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>4 Documents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Courte introduction de Gisèle Yasmeen</li> <li>• Discussions tenues en sous-groupes portant sur les caractéristiques principales du renouvellement de l'architecture des programmes du CRSH :             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ produire des connaissances;</li> <li>➤ mobiliser les connaissances;</li> <li>➤ cultiver le talent;</li> <li>➤ partenariats et alliances.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Note: Groups to be facilitated by mixture of Leaders &amp; SSHRC managers.</p>		<p>Remarque : Des leaders et des gestionnaires se joindront aux groupes afin d'animer les discussions.</p>
<p><b>2:30 pm</b></p>		<p><b>14 h 30</b></p>
<p><b>Break</b> <i>15 minutes</i></p>		<p><b>Pause</b> <i>15 minutes</i></p>
<p><b>REPORTS-BACK FROM BREAKOUT TABLES (plenary)</b></p>		<p><b>COMPTES-RENDUS DE GROUPE PRÉSENTÉS LORS DE LA SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE</b></p>
<p><b>2:45 pm</b></p>		<p><b>14 H 45</b></p>
<p><b>WORKING GROUPS ON KEY POLICY QUESTIONS RELATED TO SSHRC'S PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE RENEWAL</b></p>		<p><b>GROUPES DE TRAVAIL SUR LES PRINCIPALES QUESTIONS DE POLITIQUES LIÉES AU RENOUELEMENT DE L'ARCHITECTURE DES PROGRAMMES DU CRSH</b></p>
<p><b>3:15 pm</b></p>		<p><b>15 h 15</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short introduction by Brent Herbert-Copley, vice-president, grants and fellowships</li> </ul>	<p>5 Documents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Courte introduction de Brent Herbert-Copley, vice-président des Subventions et des Bourses</li> </ul>

- Breakout table discussions on key cross-cutting policy and procedural questions related to program architecture, as well as issues raised by Leaders and the Blue Ribbon Panel Report:
    - New/untentured scholars
    - International collaboration
    - Capturing outcomes and impacts at the institutional and program level
    - Peer review and adjudication processes
    - Aboriginal research
  - Discussions tenues en sous-groupes portant sur d'importantes questions de portée générale liées aux politiques et aux processus concernant l'architecture des programmes et questions soulevées par les leaders et dans le rapport du groupe d'experts indépendant :
    - nouveaux chercheurs et chercheurs sans poste permanent;
    - collaboration internationale;
    - saisir les résultats et les impacts au sein des établissements et des programmes;
    - évaluation par les pairs et processus d'évaluation;
    - recherche autochtone.
- Note: Groups to be facilitated by mixture of Leaders & SSHRC managers.
- Remarque : Des leaders et des gestionnaires se joindront aux groupes afin d'animer les discussions.

<b>REPORTS-BACK FROM BREAKOUT TABLES (plenary)</b>	<b>COMPTES-RENDUS DES GROUPES PRÉSENTÉS LORS DE LA SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE</b>
<b>4:15 pm</b>	<b>16 H 15</b>
<b>WRAP-UP FOR DAY 1</b>	<b>RÉCAPITULATION DU PREMIER JOUR</b>
<b>4:45 pm</b>	<b>16 H 45</b>
Identification of discussion points to be carried forward into Day 2	Choix des sujets de discussion à reporter à la deuxième journée
<b>DIGGING INTO DATA LAUNCH AND RECEPTION</b>	<b>LANCEMENT ET RÉCEPTION DU DIGGING INTO DATA CHALLENGE</b>
<b>5:15 pm</b>	<b>17 H 15</b>
Keynote address by Jim Leach, Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities	Discours de Jim Leach, président du National Endowment for the Humanities
6 Documents	



<b>Friday, December 4, 2009</b>		<b>Vendredi 4 décembre 2009</b>
Laurier Salon Marriott Hotel 100 Kent Street, Ottawa		Salon Laurier Hôtel Marriott 100, rue Kent, Ottawa
<b>8:30 am</b>		<b>8 h 30</b>
Breakfast		Déjeuner
<b>CHECK-IN AND REVIEW OF AGENDA</b>		<b>EXAMEN DE L'ORDRE DU JOUR</b>
<b>9:00 am</b>		<b>9 h</b>
<b>INTER-AGENCY PROGRAMMING AND COLLABORATION (plenary)</b>		<b>ÉLABORATION DE PROGRAMMES ET COLLABORATION INTERORGANISMES (séance plénière)</b>
<b>9:15 am</b>		<b>9 h 15</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Carmen Charette, executive vice-president, SSHRC</li> <li>➤ Jac van Beek, Vice-president, programs and planning, Canada Foundation for Innovation</li> <li>➤ Michelle Gagnon, director, knowledge synthesis and exchange, Canadian Institutes of Health Research</li> <li>➤ Margaret McCuaig-Johnston, executive vice-president, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council</li> </ul>	<p><b>7</b> Document</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Carmen Charette, vice-présidente directrice, CRSH</li> <li>➤ Jac van Beek, vice-président, Programmes et Planification, FCI</li> <li>➤ Michelle Gagnon, directrice, Synthèse et Échange de connaissances, IRSC</li> <li>➤ Margaret McCuaig-Johnston, vice-présidente directrice, CRSNG</li> </ul>
<b>10:30 am</b>		<b>10 h 30</b>
Break <i>15 minutes</i>		Pause <i>15 minutes</i>
<b>COLLABORATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES</b>		<b>COLLABORATION AVEC D'AUTRES ORGANISMES</b>
<b>10:45 am</b>		<b>10 h 45</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breakout group discussions on programming at CFI, CIHR, NSERC</li> </ul>	<p><b>7.1-7.3</b> Documents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussions tenues en sous-groupes portant sur les programmes de la FCI, des IRSC et du CRSNG :</li> </ul>

- What specific actions can be taken to keep improving social sciences and humanities participation in these programs?
- What are the issues that need to be addressed?

- quelles mesures particulières peut-on prendre pour continuer d'améliorer la participation des sciences humaines à ces programmes?
- quels sont les problèmes à régler?

Groups to be led by Leaders & others closely involved in social science and humanities programming at these agencies.

Les groupes seront animés par des leaders et par d'autres personnes participant aux programmes de sciences humaines de ces organismes.

**12:00 pm**

**12 h**

Lunch

Dîner

1 Hour

1 heure

**REPORTS-BACK FROM BREAKOUT GROUPS**

**COMPTES-RENDUS DE GROUPE PRÉSENTÉS LORS DE LA SÉANCE PLÈNIÈRE**

**1:00 pm**

**13 h**

**ONGOING COLLABORATION AND SSHRC LEADERS ACTION PLAN**

**COLLABORATION CONTINUE ET PLAN D'ACTION DES LEADERS POUR LE CRSH**

**1:30 pm**

**13 h 30**

Breakout groups to discuss next steps for Leaders (e.g., ongoing working groups) and any revisions to the Leaders Action Plan.

**8**  
Documents

Discussions tenues en sous-groupes portant sur les prochaines étapes à suivre pour les leaders (p. ex. continuité des groupes de travail) et sur les modifications liées au plan d'action des leaders

**2:30 pm**

**14 h 30**

<b>Break</b> <i>15 minutes</i>	<b>Pause</b> <i>15 minutes</i>
<b>REPORTS-BACK FROM BREAKOUT GROUPS</b>	<b>COMPTES-RENDUS DE GROUPE PRÉSENTÉS LORS DE LA SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE</b>
<b>2:45 pm</b>	<b>14 h 45</b>
<b>WRAP-UP AND EVALUATION</b>	<b>RÉCAPITULATION ET ÉVALUATION</b>
<b>3:15 pm</b>	<b>15 h 15</b>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	<b>LEVÉE DE LA SÉANCE</b>
<b>3:30 pm</b>	<b>15 h 30</b>

## **APPENDIX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR LEADERS MEETING**

### ***Front of binder / Pages d'introduction***

- Agenda / Ordre du jour

### ***Tab 1:***

#### **Welcome from the President and Strategic Overview / Mot de bienvenue et aperçu de l'ordre du jour**

- Canada in the Digital Age : Speaking notes for Dr. Chad Gaffield, Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage / Le Canada à l'ère numérique : notes d'allocation de Chad Gaffield, Comité permanent du patrimoine canadien

### ***Tab 2:***

#### **SSHRC's program architecture renewal and peer review processes / Renouvellement de l'architecture des programmes du Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines (CRSH) et processus d'évaluation par les pairs**

- SSHRC Program Architecture Renewal / Renouvellement de l'architecture des programmes du CRSH
- SSHRC Program Architecture Renewal - Draft Program Model / Renouvellement de l'architecture des programmes du CRSH - ébauche de modèle de programme

### ***Tab 3:***

#### **SSHRC's program architecture renewal and peer review processes / Renouvellement de l'architecture des programmes du CRSH et processus d'évaluation par les pairs**

- Promoting Excellence in Research (executive summary of Blue Ribbon Panel Report) / Promouvoir l'excellence de la recherche (résumé du rapport du groupe d'experts indépendant chargé de l'examen des pratiques d'évaluation par les pairs)

### ***Tab 4:***

#### **Working groups on SSHRC's program architecture renewal / Groupes de travail sur le renouvellement de l'architecture des programmes du CRSH**

- SSHRC's Knowledge Mobilization Strategy: 2009-2011 / Stratégie de mobilisation des connaissances du CRSH de 2009-2011

### ***Tab 5:***

#### **Working groups on key policy questions related to SSHRC's program architecture renewal / Groupes de travail sur d'importantes questions de politique liées au renouvellement de l'architecture des programmes du CRSH**

- Specific Institutional Research Resources and Supports for New Faculty (examples compiled by the AUCC-SSHRC Information Centre) / Ressources et appui de recherche institutionnels particuliers pour les nouveaux chercheurs (exemples compilés par le centre d'information de l'Association des universités et collèges du Canada [AUCC] et du CRSH)
- SSHRC International Research Collaborations: Strengthening Quality, Connections and Impacts / Recherche concertée internationale du CRSH : augmenter la qualité, la connexion et l'impact

- SSHRC Support for International Collaboration : Facts and Figures (May 2009) / Appui du CRSH lié à la collaboration internationale : faits et chiffres (mai 2009)
- Internationalization strategies and centres of study at Canadian universities (examples compiled by the AUCC-SSHRC Information Centre) / Stratégies de mondialisation et centres d'étude des universités canadiennes (exemples compilés par le centre d'information de l'AUCC et du CRSH)
- Management Response Summary: Aboriginal Research Pilot Program / Résumé de la réponse de la direction : programme pilote Réalités autochtones

**Tab 6:**

**Digging Into Data Launch and Reception /  
Lancement et réception du Digging Into Data Challenge**

- Jim Leach, chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities (biography) / Jim Leach, président, National Endowment for the Humanities (biographie)
- Announcing the Digging Into Data Challenge / Annoncer le Digging Into Data Challenge

**Tab 7:**

**Inter-agency programming and collaboration (plenary) /  
Collaboration et programmes interorganismes (séance plénière)**

- Inter-Agency Collaboration / Collaboration interorganismes

**Collaboration with other agencies /  
Collaboration avec d'autres organismes**

**Tab 7.1:**

**Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) /  
Fondation canadienne pour l'innovation (FCI)**

- Community consultation on Infrastructure in the Social Sciences and Humanities, May 2009 / Consultation menée auprès de chercheurs sur l'infrastructure des sciences humaines, mai 2009
- Annex A: Research Infrastructure in the Social Sciences and Humanities / Annexe A : infrastructure de la recherche en sciences humaines
- List of CFI's LEF/NIF awards, June 16, 2009 / Liste de subventions du Fonds de l'avant-garde (FA) et du Fonds des initiatives nouvelles (FIN) de la FCI, 16 juin 2009

**Tab 7.2:**

**Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) /  
Instituts de recherche en santé du Canada (IRSC)**

- CIHR Working Closely with SSHRC on Health Research Funding Guidelines / Les IRSC collaborent étroitement avec le CRSH quant à l'élaboration de lignes directrices liées au financement de la recherche sur la santé.
- CIHR welcomes applications from SSHRC health researchers / Les IRSC acceptent les demandes des chercheurs du CRSH provenant du domaine de la santé.
- Apply for Funding: Selecting the Appropriate Federal Granting Agency / Demande de financement : choisir le bon organisme subventionnaire fédéral
- SSHRC Leaders : Telebriefing on health-related research / Leaders pour le CRSH : téléconférence portant sur la recherche liée à la santé

- CIHR : Telebriefing on health-related research / IRSC : téléconférence portant sur la recherche liée à la santé

**Tab 7.3:**

*Natural Sciences and Engineering Council (NSERC) /  
Conseil de recherches en sciences naturelles et en génie (CRSNG)*

- Strategic Network Grants Program / Programme de subventions de réseaux stratégiques
- Strategic Project Grants / Subventions de projets stratégiques

**Tab 8:**

**Ongoing Collaboration and SSHRC Leaders Action Plan /  
Collaboration continue et plan d'action des leaders pour le CRSH**

- SSHRC Leaders Action Plan, 2009-2011 / Plan d'action de 2009-2011 des leaders pour le CRSH
- List of CIHR University Delegates / Liste des délégués universitaires des IRSC

**APPENDIX C: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

	<b>University / Université</b>	<b>Representative / Représentant</b>
1	Athabasca University	Rory McGreal Associate Vice-President, Research
2	Brandon University	Scott Grills Vice President, Academic and Research
3	Brock University	Robert Eagle Director, Brock Research
4	Carleton University	John Osborne Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
5	Université Concordia	Carole Brabant Vice-rectrice, Recherche et Études supérieures
6	Dalhousie University	Martha Crago Vice-President, Research
7	École Polytechnique de Montréal	Alain Aubertin Adjoint du directeur, Enseignement et Recherche
8	HEC Montréal	Jean-Claude Cosset Directeur de la recherche
9	Institut national de la recherche scientifique	Johanne Charbonneau Directrice, Centre <i>Urbanisation Culture Société</i>
10	Lakehead University	Todd Dufresne Professor of Philosophy
11	Université McGill	Nathalie Cooke Doyenne associée, Recherche et Études supérieures
12	Memorial University of Newfoundland	Reeta Tremblay Vice President, Academic, Pro Tempore
13	Mount Allison University	Stephen McClatchie Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research
14	Ontario Collage of Art and Design	Michael Owen Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies

15	Queen's University	Susan Marlin Vice-President, Research
16	Ryerson University	Jean-Paul Boudreau Chair, Department of Psychology
17	Simon Fraser University	Paul McFetridge Associate Dean of Arts and Social Sciences
18	St. Francis Xavier University	Keith De'Bell Associate Vice-President, Research
19	St. Mary's University	Terry Murphy Vice-President, Academic and Research
20	Thompson Rivers University	Nancy Van Wagoner Associate Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies
21	Trent University	Carol Williams Associate Professor, Tier II Canada Research Chair in Feminism & Gender Studies, WMST Dept.
22	Université de Moncton	Lise Dubois Doyenne, Faculté des études supérieures et de la recherche
23	Université de Montréal	François Bowen Vice-doyen aux études supérieures et à la recherche
24	Université du Québec à Montréal	Monique Brodeur Doyenne, Faculté des sciences de l'éducation
25	Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières	Marie-Claude Denis Doyenne des études de cycles supérieurs et de la recherche
26	Université Laval	Denis Mayrand Adjoint au vice-recteur à la recherche et à la création
27	University of Alberta	George Pavlich Associate Vice-President, Research
28	University of British Columbia	Nancy Gallini Dean, Faculty of Arts
29	University of Calgary	Gary Libben Associate Vice-President, Research
30	University of Guelph	Kris Inwood Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Studies



31	University of Manitoba	Janice Ristock Associate Vice-President, Research
32	Université du Nouveau-Brunswick	James Murray Doyen, Faculté des arts
33	University of Northern British Columbia	Gail Fondahl Vice-President, Research
34	University of Ontario Institute of Technology	Brian Campbell Associate Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies
35	Université d'Ottawa	Lori Burns Vice-doyenne à la recherche, Faculté des arts
36	University of Prince Edward Island	Katherine Schultz Vice-President, Research and Development
37	University of Regina	Anne Lavack Dean, Faculty of Business Administration
38	University of Saskatchewan	Dirk de Boer Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences (Acting)
39	University of the Fraser Valley	Brad Whittaker Director, Research Services and Industry Liaison
40	University of Toronto	Steven Hermans Social Sciences and Humanities Research Manager
41	University of Victoria	Sikata Banerjee Associate Dean, Humanities
42	University of Western Ontario	Derek Newton Manager, Research Development
43	University of Windsor	Ranjana Bird Vice-President, Research
44	University of Winnipeg	Catherine Taylor Associate Professor, Department of Rhetoric, Writing & Communications and Faculty of Education
45	Vancouver Island University	Steven Lane Dean, Faculty of Arts and Humanities

46	Wilfrid Laurier University	Paul Maxim Associate Vice-President, Research
47	Université York	David Dewitt Vice-recteur, Recherche et Innovation

**APPENDIX C2 :**  
**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FROM SSHRC AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES**  
**DECEMBER 2009**

Name/ Nom	Title/ Titre
GAFFIELD, Chad	President Président
CHARETTE, Carmen	Executive Vice-President Vice-présidente directrice
CAVALLIN, Michel	Vice-President, Common Administration Services Directorate Vice-président, Direction des services administratifs communs
HERBERT-COPLEY, Brent	Vice-President, Grants and Fellowships Vice-président, Subventions et Bourses
YASMEEN, Gisèle	Vice-President, Partnerships Vice-présidente, Partenariats
GAVREL, Jean-Claude	Associate Vice-President, Networks of Centres of Excellence Vice-président associé, Réseaux de centres d'excellence
GAGNON, Michelle	Director, Knowledge Synthesis and Exchange, Canadian Institutes of Health Research Directrice, Synthèse et Échange de connaissances, Instituts de recherche en santé du Canada
MCCUAIG-JOHNSTON, Margaret	Executive Vice-President, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council Vice-présidente directrice, Conseil de recherches en sciences naturelles et en génie
VAN BEEK, Jac	Vice-President, Programs and Planning, Canada Foundation for Innovation Vice-président, Programmes et Planification, Fondation canadienne pour l'innovation
BHATTI, Tariq	Senior Project Director, Program Architecture Renewal

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

	Directeur principal de projet, Renouvellement de l'architecture des programmes
<b>GAGNON, Murielle</b>	Director, Strategic Programs and Joint Initiatives Directrice, Programmes stratégiques et Initiatives conjointes
<b>KRCEVINAC, Gordana</b>	Director, Fellowships and Institutional Grants Directrice, Bourses et Subventions institutionnelles
<b>LYNN, Trevor</b>	Manager, Communications Gestionnaire, Communications
<b>MACDONALD, Wayne</b>	Director, Corporate Performance and Evaluation Directeur, Rendement organisationnel et Évaluation
<b>McNAUGHTON, Craig</b>	Director, Knowledge Mobilization and Program Integration Directeur, Mobilisation des connaissances et Intégration des programmes
<b>SIMARD, François</b>	Acting Director, Research and Dissemination Grants Directeur intérimaire, Subventions de recherche et de diffusion de la recherche
<b>TRAUTTMANSDORFF, Christine</b>	Director, Policy, Planning and International Affairs Directrice ; Politiques, Planification et Affaires internationales

<b>MONKMAN, Leslie</b>	Member of SSHRC Council and Chair of Programs and Quality Committee Membre du conseil d'administration du CRSH et président du Comité sur les programmes et la qualité
------------------------	---

<b>Name / Nom</b>	<b>Title / Titre</b>
<b>BASTIEN, Éric</b>	Assistant Director, Strategic Programs and Joint Initiatives Directeur adjoint, Programmes stratégiques et Initiatives conjointes
<b>BITAR, Wafa</b>	Acting Team Leader, Research and Dissemination Chef d'équipe intérimaire, Recherche et Diffusion
<b>BOARD, Suzanne</b>	Senior Policy Analyst, Policy and International Collaboration Analyste principale des politiques, Politiques et Collaboration internationale
<b>BRIAND, Daniel</b>	Administrative Assistant, Knowledge Mobilization and Program Integration Adjoint administratif, Mobilisation des connaissances et Intégration des programmes

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

<b>CRITCHLEY, Jacques</b>	Senior Program Officer, Strategic Programs and Joint Initiatives Agent principal de programme, Programmes stratégiques et Initiatives conjointes
<b>DUPUIS, Michèle</b>	Program Officer, Knowledge Mobilization and Program Integration Agente de programme, Mobilisation des connaissances et Intégration des programmes
<b>ESAM, Sara</b>	Senior Program Manager, Networks of Centres of Excellence Gestionnaire principale de programme, Réseaux de centres d'excellence
<b>FAFARD, Katherine</b>	Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Vice-President, Partnerships Conseillère principale en politiques, Bureau du vice-président, Partenariats
<b>KELLY, Bryde</b>	Program Officer, Knowledge Mobilization and Program Integration Agente de programme, Mobilisation des connaissances et Intégration des programmes
<b>PAQUETTE, Sylvie</b>	Manager, Policy and International Collaboration Gestionnaire, Politiques et Collaboration internationale
<b>RAVIGNAT, Mathieu</b>	Senior Program Officer, Strategic Programs and Joint Initiatives Agent principal de programme, Programmes stratégiques et Initiatives conjointes
<b>SAMS, Heather</b>	Coordinator, Program Integration, Mobilization and Program Integration Coordonnatrice; Intégration des programmes; Mobilisation des connaissances et Intégration des programmes
<b>SAVOIE, Adèle</b>	Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Vice-President, Grants and Fellowships Conseillère principale en politiques, Bureau du vice-président, Subventions et Bourses
<b>WAKEFIELD, Andrew</b>	Program Officer, Knowledge Mobilization and Program Integration Agent de programme, Mobilisation des connaissances et Intégration des programmes
<b>YAKE, Adam</b>	Administrative and Junior Research Officer, Office of the Vice-President, Partnerships Agent subalterne d'administration et de recherche, Bureau du vice-président, Partenariats

**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			
<b>Objectives</b>						
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
<b>Content</b>						
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
<b>Format</b>						
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
<b>Duration</b>						
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
<b>Location</b>						
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?

---

---

---

---

---

10. Do you have any suggestions on potential topics or themes for future events?

---

---

---

---

---

11. Any additional comments?

---

---

---

---

---

**Thank you for your feedback!**

## APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF EVALUATION RESPONSES

Evaluation forms received: 29

QUESTIONS	AVERAGE RESULT
<p>1) <b>The first meeting objective was met:</b>  <i>("to review and update the SSHRC Leaders Action Plan, 2009-2011")</i>                      (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.15
<p>2) <b>The second meeting objective was met:</b>  <i>("to engage Leaders on key recent developments at SSHRC, including SSHRC's program architecture renewal and peer/merit review processes")</i>                      (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.58
<p>3) <b>The overall content of the event was relevant to my information needs as the SSHRC Leader for my institution</b>                      (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.61
<p>4) <b>The event format was appropriate given the objectives of the event</b>                      (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.58
<p>5) <b>The event allowed adequate participation by all Leaders</b>                      (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.85
<p>6) <b>The duration of the event was adequate</b>                      (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.62
<p>7) <b>The time allocated to presentations and general discussion was sufficient</b>                      (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	4.62
<p>8) <b>The location was appropriate given the objectives of the event</b>                      (1 = Not at all, 5 = Entirely)</p>	3.76



**9) In general, are you satisfied with this event? What could be done to improve it? (open-ended comments)**

- I believe that one day and a half should be sufficient. Sometimes there are too many subthemes (lead 4 in general) and it is sometimes hard to choose.
- Very well organized and helpful. Great event. Discussion of plan for Leaders merited more focused conversation, initiated by SSHRC Team and SSHRC priorities.
- I agree with the comments that for newcomers it may be useful to instigate a catch-up half-day meeting.
- A wonderful job. You have brought together and built a very effective national team.
- Breakout session very useful - but hard to choose among several interesting ones. Very useful to have in downtown Ottawa so as to have opportunity for other meetings. Would have been helpful to have a bit of time after Reeta Tremblay (*on Yaffle*) and David Dewitt's (*on ResearchImpact*) presentations, if briefly (for discussions)
- Very satisfied. The idea of a pre-session for new Leaders was good.
- Very good meeting. Substantive issues discussed. Fewer breakout groups.
- Yes - materials would be sent out in advance to promote discussion on campus.
- Yes, very informative. Appreciated discussions around partnerships.
- Very - sufficient time, excellent interaction.
- Good job. Keep cheerleading to a minimum and pragmatics to a maximum.
- Yes - very much so! A room with a window.
- Yes. Excellent dialogue was presented and recorded.
- Yes. It is important.
- Yes - Excellent work!
- Very satisfied. Format was good mix - staff folks were very helpful. I like the hotel venue. Materials circulated were informative.
- Highly satisfied.
- Je suis très satisfait de l'événement. On sent qu'il est en train de se créer une dynamique très intéressante.
- I am impressed by the volume of breakout groups.
- Would like to have a networking dinner. Not enough time to interact informally.

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

- Role of KM and KT, Partnerships in T&P process. Outcomes and impacts study/metrics.
- Partnerships/alliances. New media collaborative alliance. Cross agency participation with Canada Council. Cultural innovation.
- One open-ended session on SSH scholarship in the next decade and the role of SSHRC would be nice.
- Update at beginning of event of new SSHRC developments.
- More transparency/discussion on issues facing SSHRC - re programs to be developed, strategic areas.
- A conference on knowledge mobilization. Strategies on how to retain new researchers. Strategies for infrastructure development. Conférence sur la mobilisation des connaissances. Stratégies pour soutenir les nouveaux chercheurs. Stratégies pour le développement d'infrastructure de recherche.
- Copyright and open-access.
- A comparison of the 4 and 4A categories - from fundable to funded related peer review issues.
- The plenary (finish) session raised several important issues with which we might begin the next session.
- Role out of the program architecture
- How to measure outcome and build it in the application process.
- I will think about it ☺
- Discussion on the move of health related research from SSHRC to CIHR - experiences with the first couple of rounds.
- The obvious one - Transformation. CIHR-SSHRC transition. CFI-SSHRC developments.
- Valuing the grey literature in the social sciences. The overall funding approach- working toward a more sustainable model and ensuring that SSHRC funds more of its excellent research.

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

- Please be specific and timely with requests for feedback on the new program architecture. If you want us to consult with colleagues, we need appropriate lead-time and turnaround time.
- Location was appropriate but not the venue.
- Very poor WIFI/phone connectivity. Cold airless room. Very well run and highly productive.
- More on what Leaders can do at home institutions.
- Well done.

- Craig, Gisèle and Brent - all were excellent. Thanks!
- Thank you to all the members of the SSHRC team.
- Thank you for your commitment and creativity on behalf of the social science, humanities and creative arts community.
- Great job!
- Keep up the good work!
- Excellent!
- The attack on disciplines was rather naïve. SSHRC might want to be cautious endorsing this.
- Let's have a summary of all the discussion ASAP. And many thanks for such a great event.