

GradWRITE: Graduate Writing Conference

Writing Grant Applications

Andrew Nelson
Associate Dean – Research
Faculty of Social Science

March 6, 2015

Before you start:

- what do you need?
 - money for... travel
 - equipment
 - analytical costs
 - food/beer?
- who are you writing for?
 - know your audience
- what resources do you have available?
 - SGPS
 - your supervisor
 - your grad chair
 - your colleagues
 - (some sources are more reliable than others!)

Before you start:

- who are you writing for?
 - what funding agencies are out there? - <http://pivot.cos.com/>

The screenshot shows a web browser window displaying the Pivot database website. The page title is "pivot University of Western Ontario". The search bar shows "graduate student fellowship" with a search button. The search results are displayed in a table with columns: "Citizenship/Residency", "Recently added", "Submission type", "Top funding types", "Top sponsor types", "2,883 Results", "Deadline", and "Amount".

Citizenship/Residency	Recently added	Submission type	Top funding types	Top sponsor types	2,883 Results	Deadline	Amount
Canada OR Unrestricted	Last 7 days: 10	Limited Submission: 89 Other internal coordin...: 18	Training or Scholarshi...: 1421 Research: 849 Prize or Award: 564 Dissertation or Thesis: 467 Travel: 366	Professional Society o...: 1223 Other Nonprofit: 634	☐ Graduate Student Paper Prize African Studies Association (ASA)	30 Apr 2014	see record
					☐ Graduate Student Paper Prize Middle East Studies Association (MESA)	15 Jun 2014	\$250 USD
					☐ LIMITED CAGS/ETS Award for Excellence and Innovation in Enhancing the Graduate Student Experience Canadian Association for Graduate Studies (CAGS)	30 Apr 2014	\$2,500 CAD
					☐ Robert J. McNamara Student Paper Award Association for the Sociology of Religion (ASR)	01 Jun 2014	\$500 USD
					☐ Biotechnology SS Student Achievement Award Society of Toxicology (SOT)	15 Jan 2015	\$500 USD
					☐ Graduate Student Awards Materials Research Society (MRS)	15 Aug 2014	\$400 USD
					☐ Graduate Student Paper Award American Sociological Association (ASA)	01 Feb 2015	see record

Before you start:

- who are you writing for?
 - what funding agencies are out there?
 - most students go to OGS, SSHRC, NSERC, CIHR
 - but there are others
 - Wenner Gren – Anthropology



The Wenner-Gren Foundation

supporting worldwide research in all branches of anthropology

[Home](#) | [Image Library](#) | [Annual Report](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Login](#)

ABOUT

PROGRAMS

GRANTEES

HISTORY

FOLLOW US: [t](#) [f](#) [in](#)

Other Funding Sources

Additional sources of funding for anthropological research.

[View resources](#) ▶



Frequently Asked Questions

What projects are normally NOT funded by the Foundation?

Programs

Search this site:

Programs

Dissertation Fieldwork Grants

Dissertation Fieldwork Grants are awarded to aid doctoral or thesis research. The program contributes to the Foundation's overall mission to support basic research in anthropology and to ensure that the discipline continues to be a source of vibrant and significant work that furthers our understanding of humanity's cultural and biological origins, development, and variation. The Foundation supports research that demonstrates a clear link to anthropological theory and debates, and promises to make a solid contribution to advancing these ideas. There is no preference for any methodology, research location, or subfield. The Foundation particularly welcomes proposals that employ a comparative perspective, can generate innovative approaches or ideas, and/or integrate two or more subfields.

The maximum amount of the Dissertation Fieldwork Grant is US \$20,000. Please note that the Foundation has suspended the Osmundsen Initiative supplement. Grants are non-renewable.

Students must be enrolled in a doctoral program (or equivalent, if applying from outside the United States) at the time of application. Students of all nationalities are eligible to apply. There is no time limit on the duration of the grant, and funding may be requested to cover distinct research phases (for example, two summers) if this is part of the research design. Application deadlines are **May 1** and **November 1**. Final decisions are made six months later.

Applicants must submit application materials using the Foundation's online application submission procedure as well as send printed copies to the Foundation by regular mail.

WENNER-GREN FOUNDATION FOR ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH, INC.

DISSERTATION FIELDWORK GRANT & OSMUNDSEN INITIATIVE APPLICATION Nov. 2009

(Do not change the default format. Please limit your responses to the space provided.)

1. Name of Applicant (Please give full legal name: first, middle, and SURNAME in uppercase letters): Preferred Mailing Address of Applicant: 		2. Name of Supervisor, Department, & Institution: Mailing Address of Supervisor: 	
E-mail: Telephone: Fax:		E-mail: Telephone: Fax:	
3. Applicant's Personal Information Gender: Select Date & Place of Birth: Citizenship:			
4. Applicant's Education History Highest Academic Degree: Select Year Degree Awarded: Institution Awarding Degree:			
5. Applicant's Current Doctoral Status Are you registered for a doctoral degree? Select Date you expect to receive degree: Department and institution that will award the degree: What requirements for the degree (other than the dissertation/thesis) have yet to be completed, and what is their expected date of their completion? 			
6. Title of Project:		7. Total requested for Dissertation Fieldwork Grant (maximum \$15,000): US\$ Are you applying for an Osmundsen Initiative in addition to this amount? Select	
8. Abstract of research proposal (Provide a general description of your proposal in plain English. If this proposal is successful, this abstract will be posted on the Foundation's website). 			
9. Start and end dates of project for which support is requested (start date must fall between July 1 and December 31, 2010):		10. Location where project is to be carried out: 	

Before you start:

- who are you writing for?
 - what funding agencies are out there?
 - most students go to OGS, SSHRC, NSERC, CIHR
- whatever the agency – READ THE INSTRUCTIONS
 - what do they want?
 - ask around – what works and what doesn't
 - any drafts of previous applications?

Partnerships and Projects

Directory of Scientists and Professionals

Canadian High Arctic Research Station

Northern Contaminants Program

Health Canada: Centre for Vaccine Evaluation

Science and Technology Data

Research Funding Collaboration

Co-operative Funding Programs

Policies and Guidelines

Open Access

Selecting the Appropriate Federal Granting Agency

Research Ethics

Responsible Conduct of Research

Public Communications

Institutional Agreement

Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality

Institutional Eligibility Requirements

Post-Award Administration and Finance Information

Other Collaborative Activities

Contact Us

International Research Funding Collaboration

Enhancing Global Recognition for Canadian Research Excellence

National Science and Technology Week

Science Links

Selecting the Appropriate Federal Granting Agency

- [Introduction](#)
- [General Guidelines for Submitting and Accepting Applications](#)
- General Guidelines for the Eligibility of Subject Matter
 - [SSHRC](#)
 - [NSERC](#)
 - [CIHR](#)
- Guidelines for the Eligibility of Applications Related to Health
 - [SSHRC](#)
 - [NSERC](#)
 - [CIHR](#)
- [Guidelines for the Eligibility of Applications in Psychology](#)

Introduction

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) support and promote high-quality research in a wide variety of disciplines and areas.

The granting agencies were created by Acts of Parliament, which define their individual mandates. In turn, these mandates define the areas of research funded by each agency. The agencies have each developed their own general guidelines for the eligibility of subject matter, described below.

The agencies recognize, however, that some areas of research will overlap two or more granting agencies. Therefore, individual agency mandates have been interpreted in order to ensure that areas of research that cross agency boundaries are eligible for support. This means that in some areas of research there is overlap between agency mandates, and some applications could be eligible for support by more than one federal granting agency. Therefore, more detailed guidelines have been developed for researchers working in health and psychology. Other areas of overlap include geography, business, management studies, physical education, optometry, etc.

Some research also requires an interdisciplinary approach. The agencies wish to encourage the Canadian research community to advance and lead interdisciplinary research that is cross-cutting and addresses important social, economic and health issues that matter to Canadians. This includes research that bridges more than one discipline or that requires the skills of several disciplines. The agencies support this type of research through a number of joint and co-operative programs (see "[Research Funding Collaboration](#)" for a complete listing) and have in place a number of mechanisms to ensure that interdisciplinary research is accommodated within their individual programs.

<http://www.science.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=FEE7261A-1>

Funding

[Talent Program](#)

[Insight Program](#)

[Connection Program](#)

[Priority Areas](#)

[Upcoming Deadlines](#)

[How to Apply](#)

[Subject Matter Eligibility](#)

[Selecting a Granting Agency](#)

[Application Regulations](#)

[Resource Centre](#)

[Forms](#)

[Impact Awards](#)

[Merit Review](#)

[Using Your Funds](#)

Subject Matter Eligibility

[Overview](#)

[General Guidelines for the Eligibility of Subject Matter at SSHRC](#)

[Guidelines for the Eligibility of Applications Related to Health](#)

[Guidelines for the Eligibility of Applications in Psychology](#)

[Multidisciplinary Collaboration with Other Agencies](#)

Overview

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), the [Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council](#) (NSERC) and the [Canadian Institutes of Health Research](#) (CIHR) support and promote high-quality research in a wide variety of disciplines and areas. This includes research that bridges more than one discipline or that requires the skills of several disciplines.

SSHRC collaborates closely with the other granting agencies to encourage and promote support to the full range of social science and humanities research and research training, including collaboration across disciplines and subject areas. The following guidelines have been prepared to assist applicants in directing their proposals to the most appropriate funding agency. These guidelines apply to research, research training, and related activities such as conferences or scholarly journals. In any given application, applicants should apply to the agency that is responsible for the dominant research discipline or area. A researcher, research team or student may not submit the same application to more than one of the three federal research granting agencies.

Applications submitted to SSHRC that would be more appropriately evaluated by NSERC or CIHR will not be accepted. In such cases, applicants may be required to submit a new application to the appropriate agency.

Applicants working in research areas where boundaries overlap are advised to state clearly in all applications for funding why they believe their proposals are primarily appropriate for support by the agency to which they are submitting their application.

Such applicants should contact the research services office at their institution for guidance. In addition, they should seek the advice of the appropriate program officer in charge of the program to which they are considering applying.

<http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/apply-demande/>

[background-renseignements/selecting_agency-choisir_organisme_subventionnaire-eng.aspx](#)

To start:

- what do you need?
 - when do you need it?
 - what are you doing?
-
- clear research question / hypothesis / problem / goal
-
- “so what?” / “who cares?”
 - be able to position your research within your field
 - be able to articulate your question clearly and concisely to someone who is not in your field

Writing:

- start writing
 - outline
 - rough out the sections
 - brain storm
- flesh out the outline
 - go back over the requirements
 - do the sections flow?
 - do the methods and theory match?
 - are your expectations realistic?

Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

The following criteria and scoring scheme are used by adjudication committee members to evaluate Insight Grant applications:

1. Challenge—The aim and importance of the endeavour (40%):

- originality, significance and expected contribution to knowledge;
- appropriateness of the literature review;
- appropriateness of the theoretical approach or framework;
- appropriateness of the methods/approach;
- quality of training and mentoring to be provided to students, emerging scholars and other highly qualified personnel, and opportunities for them to contribute; and
- potential influence and impact within and/or beyond the social sciences and humanities research community.

2. Feasibility—The plan to achieve excellence (20%):

- probability of effective and timely attainment of the research objectives;
- appropriateness of the requested budget and justification of proposed costs;
- indications of financial and in-kind contributions from other sources, where appropriate;
- quality of knowledge mobilization plans, including for effective knowledge dissemination, knowledge exchange and engagement within and/or beyond the research community; and
- strategies and timelines for the design and conduct of the activity/activities proposed.

3. Capability—The expertise to succeed (40%):

- quality, quantity and significance of past experience and published and/or creative outputs of the applicant and any team members relative to their roles in the project and their respective stages of career;
- evidence of contributions such as commissioned reports, professional practice, public discourse, public policies, products and services, experience in collaboration, etc.;
- evidence of contributions to the development of talent; and
- potential to make future contributions.

http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/insight_grants-subventions_savoir-eng.aspx#4

Appendix 3 - Scoring System

To be recommended for funding, applications must receive a minimum score of 3.0 for each of the three criteria.

Table 1: Challenge and Feasibility

If the nature of the research proposed is such that a theoretical framework or any other component mentioned in this table is not necessary, this component should not be taken into account in the evaluation of the proposed research. If a committee member's rationale for assigning a score to a particular application differs significantly from what is prescribed in the table, he or she must be prepared to briefly explain their reasons when reporting on the application at the committee meeting.

Score Range	Challenge (40%)	Feasibility (20%)
5-6	Very Good -Excellent: Highly original, at the forefront of the field. The literature review is complete and up-to-date, and is linked to the proposed research. The theoretical/ conceptual approach or framework is highly focused, fully explained and well developed. The methodology is very well described and will lead to meaningful results. The training opportunities, where applicable, and likelihood of influence/impact within and/or beyond the research community are excellent.	Very Good -Excellent: Objectives are very explicit and clearly defined, and there is a very high probability of meeting them. All budget components are well justified, and the budget's overall link to the proposed research is evident. The knowledge mobilization/ dissemination plan, where appropriate, is very effective and very likely to achieve success. The strategies/timelines for the proposed research are very coherent, realistic and appropriate.
4-4.9	Good - Very good: Original, meets quality standards and will contribute to the development of the field. One or more of the following elements should have been better developed: literature review, theoretical/ conceptual framework, and/or methodology. The training opportunities, where applicable, and likelihood of influence/impact within and/or beyond the research community, are very good.	Good - Very good: Objectives are defined and it is likely that they will be met. One or more of the following elements should have been better developed: strategies/timelines for the proposed research, justification for the budget, and/or knowledge mobilization/dissemination plans.
3-3.9	Satisfactory - Good: A good research proposal, but lacks at least one compelling element. The committee has concerns regarding one or more of the following: originality/novelty, literature review, theoretical/conceptual framework, and/or methodology. Training opportunities, where applicable, are good, as is the likelihood of influence/impact within and/or beyond the research community.	Satisfactory - Good: Objectives are identified but the committee has doubts that they will be met. Concerns exist regarding one or more of the following elements: strategies/timelines for the proposed research, justification for the budget, and/or knowledge mobilization/ dissemination plans.
Below 3	Unsatisfactory: Proposal has low probability of significant contribution to the field. There are serious shortcomings in one or more of the following elements: originality/novelty, literature review, theoretical/conceptual framework, and/or methodology. Training opportunities, where applicable, are modest, as is the likelihood of influence/impact within and/or beyond the research community.	Unsatisfactory: Objectives are ill-defined and there is a low probability of achieving success. There are serious shortcomings in one or more of the following elements: strategies/timelines for the proposed research, justification for the budget and/or knowledge mobilization/ dissemination plans.

To start:

- common sections
 - introduction
 - theoretical context
 - methods/materials
 - expected conclusions
 - impact
 - knowledge mobilization
- or, maybe you have to have all this stuff together in a single 1 or 2 page section!

Writing:

- organization
 - say what you are doing and why it is important within the first paragraph (or two)
 - grab the reader
 - contextualize what you're doing
 - is this new? innovative?
 - related research
 - conclude by telling the reader again why this is important

Writing:

- **theoretical context**
 - more important in some areas than others
 - important for positioning the research in the field
 - key rationale for the research question
- **methods**
 - consistent with the theoretical context?
 - why these methods?
 - if the methods are non-standard – rationalize
- **timeline**
 - is your research “doable” within the available time

Writing:

- budget
 - do you need to include a budget?
 - budget justification?
 - if so, make sure that you can demonstrate how the budget items are critical for the success of the research
 - don't pad
- your record - CV
 - include relevant items
 - e.g. work at MacDonald's might not be relevant, unless you were a manager and leadership is relevant to the proposal
 - awards
 - service (get involved!)
 - don't be shy! – but don't bulls—t!

Writing:

- general strategic tips
 - don't fill every available inch of space
 - give the reader's eyes a break
 - if you are desperate for space and are including citations, the author-date citation system takes up a lot of space – a numeric system with numbered bibliography saves space
- review the requirements
 - any enclosures/attachments required
 - letters of reference? – help your referees!
 - complete all sections – leave *nothing* blank
 - proof read – again – have a colleague read – NO TYPOS
 - be professional

Writing:

- polish
 - consider your audience
 - will your application be assessed by a disciplinary or multidisciplinary committee?
 - the answer will affect your use of language and level of technical detail
 - in general... *“describe your program of study in non-technical terms. Write your proposal in clear, plain language and avoid jargon...”*.
- don't give the committee the excuse to dump your file
- think about the reader – a single reviewer might have 40 files to read
 - you want yours to stand out!

Letters of Recommendation:

- who to ask?
 - your supervisor
 - beyond that – how well do you know the prof? / they you?
 - what is their rank/reputation?
- equip them well
 - give them all the info on the grant
 - why are you asking them?
 - give them what you have written
 - your CV
 - the necessary info they will need to complete forms (eg student #)
 - written work
 - anything that you want them to address in particular
 - give them PLENTY OF TIME!

Submit:

- how do you submit?
 - online, by mail?
- what is the deadline?
 - postmark deadline?
 - is there an internal deadline – departmental? faculty? – may be earlier than what is posted on the agency's web site
 - **DON'T LEAVE THINGS TO THE LAST MINUTE**
 - **ESPECIALLY REQUESTS FOR LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION!!!!**

Great applications are:

- Excellent throughout
- Creative
- “So what?” is clear to an interdisciplinary audience, including “so what” beyond academia if appropriate
- Seamless:
 - Lit review supports methods
 - Budget justification, plan of work are consistent
 - there is expected impact – either to the academy, to the public or both
- They *SPARKLE*

Go for it...

**you certainly won't get funding if you
don't apply!!!!**