
URB Task Force Steering Committee
Support for SSAH Research at Western

Interim Report

January 20th, 2016

Steering Committee Membership:
Andrew Nelson (Chair); Cathy Benedict; Jacquie Burkell;
Alison Doherty; Jonathan Vance, Charles Weijer

Contents

Preamble

Activities

Interim Findings

- 1) The External Context for SSAH Research in Canada
- 2) How is SSAH research valued at Western, and how does Western recognize leading edge scholarly activity in the SSAH disciplines?
- 3) How is SSAH research supported at Western, and how can that support be improved?

Summary

Next Steps

Appendices

- Appendix A: URB Task Force Steering Committee – Support for Research in Social Science, Arts and Humanities at Western – Initial Report: Membership, Mission and Objectives, Communications and Outreach
- Appendix B: Working Group Membership
- Appendix C: External Consultants
- Appendix D: Interview Consultation Guide
- Appendix E: Qualtrics Online Questionnaire

Preamble

The Task Force Steering Committee (SC) was formed by the University Research Board (URB) at the request of the Vice-President (Research) to examine the ways in which researchers in Social Science, Arts, and Humanities (SSAH) disciplines are supported at Western. The proposal for this Task Force was first presented to Senate by Dr. Capone as part of the President's *Engaging the Campus Community* report (S.15-107a) on June 5th, 2015. The final details were approved by the URB and were presented to Senate by Dr. Capone as part of the *Report of the University Research Board* (S.15-166) on September 18th, 2015. The Membership, Mission and Terms of Reference of the Task Force, were included in the Senate documents of that date in Exhibit IV, Appendix 1. That document is included here as Appendix A. This interim report was to be delivered in mid-January, and a final report in early April, 2016.

This task force is one of several initiatives that were undertaken as part of the Western community's response to the issues surrounding Executive compensation and wider concerns about governance at Western. See <http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/> for a listing of these initiatives. Concerns expressed by the Western SSAH community focused on the current structure of internal funding, on the perceived lack of appreciation for and support of SSAH research, and on a perceived bias against SSAH research in official communications and advocacy efforts from the University (see the "Working Paper on Research Funding at Western University, July 19th, 2015, prepared by a faculty working group in the Faculty of Arts & Humanities - <https://senateoflilliputwest.wordpress.com/ah-working-papers/research/>).

The details of the Terms of Reference were crafted to address these issues, and are presented in Appendix A, but they can be summarized here as follows:

- 1) what is the external (to Western) context for SSAH research?
- 2) how is SSAH research valued at Western, and how does Western recognize leading edge scholarly activity in the SSAH disciplines?
- 3) how is SSAH research supported at Western, and how can that support be improved?

In order to pursue these areas of inquiry, the steering committee recruited members for three working groups, which map onto the three key questions presented above. Each working group includes two or more SC members, additional faculty from the 8 SSAH faculties (with one representative from Schulich), and a graduate student. Complete working group membership is presented here in Appendix B. The SSAH ADR group has been an important advisory group, as well as a vehicle for disseminating information.

Activities

The three working groups have been following different schedules and strategies as a means of addressing their key questions.

Working Group #1 – external context. The initial step taken to address the external context was for SC members Nelson & Weijer to visit the primary SSAH funding agencies in Ottawa on September 28th, 29th and 30th. During that visit, they met with Vice President or equivalent staff members of Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR), National Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), National Centres for Excellence (NCE), Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and the Canada Council for the Arts. We are grateful for the cooperation and assistance of these individuals. They are listed in Appendix C. Since then, Working Group 1 has been collating the notes from that visit, working through council documents and following up to the visits with telephone conversations. One important task being undertaken by this working group

is to analyze the rhetoric and design of the web sites of the external agencies, as well as a discourse analysis of their (and our own) strategic plans seeking to understand how the design and language use reflect the stated goals of those institutions.

Working Group #2 – SSAH research at Western. The working group includes one representative from each of the eight SSAH faculties on campus. With the support of the VPR, we have hired two research assistants to assist with this component of the task force activities.

This working group has taken a dual-pronged approach to gauge the opinions of SSAH researchers at Western, including both qualitative consultations and an online survey that will be made available to all SSAH faculty members. Each faculty representative is coordinating consultations within their faculty, facilitated by an interview guide developed by the Working Group (included here as Appendix D). These consultations began in November, and will continue until mid-February. Across the SSAH faculties, a variety of consultation approaches are being used, including individual interviews, group interviews, discussions at departmental and faculty meetings, and email exchanges. These consultations allow a rich and fine-grained exploration of issues with small groups and/or individuals within each faculty. The working group is also undertaking an online Qualtrics survey of SSAH faculty members at Western. The survey has been drafted, based on the interview guide and early results of the faculty consultations. The survey is included as Appendix E. The link to the survey will be distributed to all SSAH faculty members by the Associate Deans of Research in the respective faculties, with the objective of maximizing participation from SSAH faculty members. The results of the survey and faculty consultations will be integrated into a report summarizing faculty member perspectives on the ways in which SSAH research is supported at Western.

Working Group #3 – support for SSAH research at Western. Working Group #3 has been sampling a variety of aspects of the ways in which SSAH research is supported at Western and how that support might be improved. This includes:

- a consultation on centrally controlled internal funding support for SSAH research at Western, being done as part of the WG #2 consultations
- analysis of historic versus current funding patterns (being done in consultation with Patrick Callaghan)
- a survey of internal funding practices at other universities
- consultation with communications officers in the various faculties and at RDS and Western Communications
- consultation with Western Alumni

Finally, the three working group members who are students have formed a separate working group to sample the students' perspectives on supports for SSAH research at Western.

In addition, the committee Chair has met, or will soon meet, with the eight SSAH faculties at the Chair or Director level to discuss the activities of the task force.

Interim Findings

The activities of this task force are ongoing, and the SC is keen not to anticipate any of the conclusions of the final report. However, the mission and terms of reference of the task force were designed with an iterative flow of information from one section to the next. This is particularly true of the external context of the SSAH disciplines in Canada, so that context will be explored in some detail here. Final recommendations will be presented in the final report of this task force.

1). The External Context for SSAH Research in Canada

For our assessment of the external context for SSAH research in Canada, we chose to visit with CIHR, NSERC, SSHRC, NCE, CFI and the Canada Council for the Arts during a trip to Ottawa in September 2015. The Canada Council does not fund research, but many of its concerns with relevance, excellence and value for dollars are similar to those that cross the SSAH spectrum. These visits were followed up with emails and telephone calls as appropriate. The Federation for Humanities and Social Sciences and the Canada Research Chairs secretariat were not visited at that time, but separate consultations were held with them.

In the wake of the fall 2015 election, there is a sense of relief and optimism for the future of research in Canada among the granting councils. From the SSAH perspective, the new Minister of Science, Kristy Duncan, has a PhD in Geography, the new Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Navdeep Singh Bains, has a degree in Finance, and the long form census has been quickly restored. However, many contacts were also cautious, noting that funding for research had also been cut by previous Liberal governments. An interesting analysis of the current research situation in Canada can be found in a Times Higher Education article: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/are-blue-skies-back-for-canadas-scientists>.

In the following section, each agency will be reviewed, touching on their mandate, their current strategic direction, and where appropriate, comments about specific concerns, issues and opportunities.

SSHRC

SSHRC is coming to the end of its current strategic plan *Strengthening Canada's Cultures of Innovation - Strategic Plan 2013-16* (http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/publications/strategic_plan_2013-16-plan_strategique_2013-2016_e.pdf), which saw substantial changes in program architecture (initiated in the document *Framing Our Direction 2010-12*). These changes saw the streamlining of SSHRC's myriad funding opportunities into three main areas: Insight, Partnership and Talent. SSHRC's next strategic plan will apparently not be "revolutionary", but it will focus the emphasis on three broad areas:

- SSHRC's role in equipping the research community to deal with and promote research excellence in the context of the evolving landscape – includes the greater integration of Aboriginal research
- partnerships – expand and extend reach – including knowledge mobilization
- connect the SSAH disciplines to Canadians (Imagining Canada's Future – see below)

The current program architecture is deemed to be solid, so the focus will be on capitalizing on our research efforts and responding to demand from the community at large. Open access, digital data management and knowledge mobilization will continue to be areas of emphasis at SSHRC.

An important feature of SSHRC's current strategic plan has been its emphasis on *Imagining Canada's Future*. This initiative was launched in 2011, but it is outlined in the 2013 document *Imagining Canada's Future - Future Challenge Areas and Sub-questions* http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/society-societe/community-communitite/Future_Challenge_Areas-domaines_des_defis_de_demain-eng.aspx. SSHRC has assigned an Associate Vice President to this area (Ursula Gobel). The objectives of this initiative are to inspire researchers to work collaboratively on issues of relevance to Canada today, to position SSHRC research as making a valid and concrete contribution to Canadian society, now and in the future, and to provide a framework for communicating the value of SSAH research to stakeholders and society at large.

Since the new program architecture was rolled out, SSHRC has tinkered with the way budgets are handled, which has led to some confusion within committees and to applicants. The principle outcome has been the concentration of larger sums of money in fewer projects, driving success rates down considerably from historic levels of ca. 40% (37% in 2011-2012, the last year of Standard Research Grants) to ca. 25% (23.4% for Insight grants in 2015-16) (<http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/results-resultats/stats-statistiques/index-eng.aspx>). Applications to the Insight program were down by approximately 320 in the fall of 2015, perhaps reflecting the reduction in success rate.

One SSHRC issue that continues to be a source of frustration with the social determinants of health research community is the decision that SSHRC should not fund health related research. This decision was the result of the 2008 “Strategic Program Review” as part of the 2009 Federal budget, and it fell under the heading “Streamlining research activities to reduce overlap in granting programs” (see <http://www.budget.gc.ca/2009/plan/bpa3-eng.html>). As this was a decision of cabinet, no additional public reports with details about the decision are available. SSHRC has certainly heard the concerns of the research community and they are making some efforts to improve the situation. For example, over the years, the guidelines for subject matter eligibility have solidified and become clearer (see http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/apply-demande/background-renseignements/selecting_agency-choisir_organisme_subventionnaire-eng.aspx), and this year a joint CIHR-SSHRC Partnership Development Grant opportunity in “Healthy and Productive Work” was rolled out (see <http://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/49213.html>). However, it is clear that the overall decision to remove health from SSHRC’s mandate will not change any time soon. Thus, our researchers should take advantage of the opportunities that do arise, and we should support them to be better positioned within CIHR (see below).

CIHR

According to the Parliamentary act of creation for the CIHR (Canadian Institutes of Health Research Act, S.C. 2000, c. 6 <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-18.1/page-1.html>):

“The objective of the CIHR is to excel, according to internationally accepted standards of scientific excellence, in the creation of new knowledge and its translation into improved health for Canadians, more effective health services and products and a strengthened Canadian health care system, by”... among other things,

“(d) encouraging interdisciplinary, integrative health research through the creation of Health Research Institutes that

- (i) together pertain to all aspects of health,
- (ii) include bio-medical research, clinical research, research respecting health systems, health services, the health of populations, *societal and cultural dimensions* of health and environmental influences on health, and other research as required.” (emphasis added)

Thus, CIHR’s mandate encompasses all major themes of health research, *regardless of the discipline*, under the four pillars of 1. Biomedical, 2. Clinical, 3. Health Services and 4. Social, Cultural, Environmental and Population Health.

In the wake of the 2008 Strategic Program Review referred to above, all health related research that had previously been funded by SSHRC or NSERC was directed to CIHR, where, according to the CIHR Act it should have found a welcoming home. However, it is clear that this has not been universally the case. The committee structure and rigid quantitative approach to analysis, among other things, made it difficult for SSAH-health oriented projects to be successful at CIHR (see Graham, J. et al. 2011. The end of medical anthropology in Canada. *University Affairs* <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/the-end-of-medical-anthorpology-in-canada/>). The lack of coordination among the councils has been recognized (see CIHR’s International Review Panel Report, June 2011 - <http://www.cihr->

irsc.gc.ca/e/43993.html). However, there are signs that things are improving. According to internal CIHR data made available to the committee, CIHR has seen a 69.9% increase in applications for health-related social science and humanities research over the past 10 years, with an average success rate of 28%. This represents a total of \$254.6M for Investigator initiated projects and \$115.7M through priority-driven mechanisms.

CIHR is in the throes of unrolling its new funding program scheme as outlined in its strategic plan *Health Research Roadmap II: Capturing Innovation to Produce Better Health and Health Care for Canadians* (see <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/48964.html>). The new Roadmap created two new streams of funding, the Foundation and Project schemes, and replaced the previous committee structure with a new College of reviewers. While there is a great deal of debate in the community about this new Roadmap (see Drinkjovic J., 2014 Funding changes usher in a dark age for Canadian science – *Globe & Mail* - <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/funding-changes-usher-in-a-dark-age-for-canadian-science/article22100092/>) it is possible that this initiative may further improve the chances for SSAH researchers at CIHR (see Halbersma J. 2014 It's time for social scientists of apply for CIHR grants. *University Affairs* <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/time-social-scientists-apply-cihr-grants/>).

NSERC

NSERC started its new strategic plan: *NSERC 2020* in 2015 (see http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/NSERC-CRSNG/NSERC2020-CRSNG2020/index_eng.asp). NSERC has avoided the program architecture upheaval that the other tricouncils have undergone, as they are satisfied that the current system is functioning effectively (as reinforced by external appraisal). NSERC 2020 identifies four aspirational priorities:

- Fostering a science culture in Canada.
- Building a diversified and competitive research base.
- Strengthening the dynamic between discovery and innovation.
- Going global.

One of their major concerns is to increase diversity in their pool of researchers, particularly increasing supports for women, Aboriginal researchers and researchers at different stages of their careers. (see also <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/news-article/nsercs-big-plans-for-the-next-five-years-funds-pending/>).

Discovery grants are the core of the NSERC program, and they take up approximately one third of the total budget. Discovery grants are open to any kind of research that fits NSERC's core mandate. According to the NSERC Act (Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council Act R.S.C., 1985, c. N-2; see <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/N-21/>) "the functions of the Council are to (a) promote and assist research in the natural sciences and engineering, other than the health sciences..." and to be eligible for NSERC funding, the "The intended objective(s) of the research must primarily be to advance knowledge in one or more of the natural science or engineering disciplines." (see <http://www.science.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=FEE7261A-1#NSERC1>). SSAH research that is commonly funded by NSERC includes primatology, paleontology (pre-*Homo sapiens*), econometrics and some areas of psychology, however, research teams funded by NSERC are becoming increasingly interdisciplinary (although NSERC's usage of "interdisciplinarity" appears to be more intra-council than at SSHRC or CIHR).

NSERC's Strategic Partnership Grants (see http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/Professors-Professeurs/RPP-PP/SPG-SPS_eng.asp) appear to be a vehicle that could permit collaboration of SSAH and NSERC

researchers, particularly where the research has policy or socio-economic implications. In such collaborations, as much as 30% of the budget can be earmarked for the extra-NSERC experts. Strategic Partnership Grants are targeted on four areas: 1) Advanced Manufacturing, 2) Environment and Agriculture, 3) Information and Communications Technologies and 4) Natural Resources and Energy.

Summary Comments on the Tricouncils

All three tricouncils share several components to their current strategic plans. They all stress:

- interdisciplinarity
- collaborative teams and partnerships
- international collaborations
- a focus on Aboriginal issues
- open access publications
- data management
- digital curation
- knowledge mobilization/translation/transfer
- making the research visible and relevant to Canada

Beyond the components of the strategic plans, there are other elements in common including:

- when asked about what kinds of research they fund, they all point to the Parliamentary Acts of creation, although it is clear that there is some room for reinterpretation of those acts (see CFI below).
- there is some measure of interest in cross-council cooperation, but there are clearly differing levels of enthusiasm amongst the different councils. The external impression is that SSHRC appears to have the most enthusiasm in this area and NSERC the least. There will apparently be a TC3+ (tricouncils+CFI) interagency summit in 2017 to explore possible mechanisms for more collaboration/cooperation. In the meantime, focused opportunities such as the SSHRC-CIHR Partnership Development Grant and the NSERC Strategic Partnership Grant are at least cause for optimism.

CFI

According to the CFI Budget Implementation Act, 1997, S.C. 1997, c. 26 (see : <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/PDF/B-9.81.pdf>), CFI was established primarily to allow for “the modernization, acquisition, development, operation or maintenance of *research infrastructure* by the recipient in Canada;” (emphasis added). “Research” was defined as “the attempt by careful scientific or technical enquiry, experimentation, study, observation, analysis and recording to discover new facts, knowledge and information, to develop new interpretations of facts, knowledge or information, or to discover new means of applying existing knowledge, relating to

- (a) a science;
- (b) health;
- (c) engineering; or
- (d) the environment.”

That definition would not appear to allow for the consideration of much SSAH research.

However, CFI’s *Strategic Road Map 2012-2017* (see <http://www.innovation.ca/sites/default/files/pdf/2011%20CFI%20Strategic%20Roadmap%20final%20English%202012-04-04.pdf>), “identifies three specific areas of opportunity where CFI can contribute to

increase our ability to understand the world in which we live, address *social, economic* (emphasis added) and environmental challenges and improve the health and well-being of Canadians:

- Sustaining and enhancing the world-class capacity of Canada’s research institutions;
- Fostering collaboration and integration between academic research and the private, public and not-for-profit sectors; and,
- Increasing the global influence of Canadian research in ways that benefit Canadian society.”

In the years since its creation, CFI has funded many SSAH projects. For instance, according to data shared with the committee by CFI, within the JR Evans Fund, approximately 50% flow to projects identified with CIHR, 45% to NSERC projects and 5% to SSHRC projects (including several here at Western). While the percentage appears to be small, many of the SSAH projects are small, and the success rates are comparable across the councils. According to the information available on the CFI funded projects web site

<http://www.innovation.ca/en/OurInvestments/ProjectsFunded/Downloaddatabase>, the total breakdown in among its four “sectors” is:

Sectors	CFI dollars	percentage of total \$5,413,640,644
Arts and Literature	\$55,356,504	1.0%
Health	\$1,736,449,630	32.1%
Human and Social Sciences	\$216,564,908	4.0%
Natural Sciences	\$3,406,269,602	62.9%

This represents a total investment in the SSAH sector of \$271,921,412.

CFI is keen to “break the myth” that it is not a SSAH-friendly agency. They have worked with SSHRC and The Federation to identify areas where problems exist, and to get the appropriate kind of expertise on evaluation panels. Our informants did identify several common issues that they felt caused problems with SSAH projects:

- the key question that needs to be clearly articulated is: “how does the infrastructure enable the research”?
 - many SSAH projects have a database angle, but the creation of a database cannot be an end in and of itself, it must fill a gap to enable research not otherwise possible
- SSAH researchers tend to have excellent “big questions”, but they often fail in framing the questions in impactful ways.
- SSAH projects need to do a better job of demonstrating that they have the necessary expertise on the team to complete the project

Our informants noted that the barriers to SSAH projects were often at the institutional level; in terms of the level of institutional support and the allocation of funding envelopes. In addition, institutions can do a better job of making the linkage between SSHRC’s Partnership Program and CFI eligibility (see <http://www.innovation.ca/en/OurFunds/CFIFunds/JohnREvansLeadersFund/SSHRC>) and of encouraging SSAH based CFI projects in general. They also allowed that CFI also needs to do a better job of messaging to the SSAH community.

NCE

The Network of Centres of Excellence appears not to have been created by an Act of Parliament, as most of the other granting agencies were. Rather, the NCE was created in 1989 as a collaborative undertaking including SSHRC, NSERC, CIHR, Industry Canada and Health Canada (who continue to jointly manage the program). Its creation “was prompted and guided in large part by discussions with the National

Advisory Board on Science and Technology, and the Council of Science and Technology Ministers” (NCE 2004, The Networks of Centres of Excellence Program: 15 Years of Innovation and Leadership 1989-2004. Anniversary Report - <http://www.nce-rce.gc.ca/docs/reports/NCE-histEN.pdf>). Thus, the program does not have a legislatively defined mandate, and the explicit interagency governance model encourages (requires) interdisciplinarity and flexibility. The goal of the program as stated in the program guide is “to mobilize Canada's research talent in the academic, private, public, and not-for-profit sectors and apply it to the task of developing the economy and improving the quality of life of Canadians.” (http://www.nce-rce.gc.ca/ReportsPublications-RapportsPublications/NCE-RCE/ProgramGuide-GuideProgramme_eng.asp).

NCE projects seek to find “solutions to major *social, economic* or health issues calls for a collaborative approach and a wide range of research expertise.” (emphasis added) (http://www.nce-rce.gc.ca/Programs-Programmes/NCE-RCE/Index_eng.asp). There are four programs within the NCE envelope, but the majority of SSAH research is focused in the “classic NCE” program (Networks of Centres of Excellence Program - http://www.nce-rce.gc.ca/Programs-Programmes/NCE-RCE/Index_eng.asp). These networks are large (involving researchers from two or more tricouncils, multiple institutions, and community and private sector partners) and the emphasis is on mobilization (including commercialization) of research rather than primary research.

The NCE program is actively seeking to break down the barriers between the tricouncils. The involvement of SSAH researchers over the years has apparently ebbed and flowed. Our NCE contacts informed us that approximately 20% of the researchers in networks funded by this program come from SSAH disciplines (ca. 65% from NSERC and 31% from health science disciplines [researchers could identify more than one]). The actual distribution of funds was not tracked across the tricouncil sectors. Like CFI, our NCE contacts expressed the opinion that SSAH projects tend to have good research problems as outlined in letters of intent, but when they fail, it is in the execution of the full application. The plans need to be very clear, as do the indicators and bench marks of success, and ultimate self-sustainability is a key outcome.

The key indicator for success in the NCE program is an established track record of collaborative research. Thus, when the calls for proposals come out, it is already too late to put together a team. In this way, the NCE program is much like a SSHRC Partnership grant. Some universities establish explicit multiyear plans to set up research groups for NCE proposals. The difficulty with such a strategy is that the target of the next NCE call (2018) has not yet been established (our contact talked about the “awesome responsibility of targeting the call”).

2). How is SSAH research valued at Western, and how does Western recognize leading edge scholarly activity in the SSAH disciplines?

The results of the internal discussion of this issue are not yet available, and impressionistic data will not be presented here. However, how excellence and impact were defined was part of the discussion with the external groups. That information will be summarized here.

Evaluation of Excellence by External Agencies

The discussion with the external agencies of how excellence is recognized and evaluated was one of the most enlightening aspects of this exercise. The very clear conclusion is that there is *no single metric, or set of metrics or qualitative indicators that can be utilized across agencies and even within agencies across different programs*. Furthermore, different indicators are utilized, depending on whether the

researcher is being assessed, the project, the program or the agency. Finally, the “inputs” into research evaluation are quite variable, running from automated citation counts to the subjective evaluation of text in final reports.

If we can gain a better understanding of how external agencies assess excellence, we can better determine how to assess it internally to improve the competitiveness of our researchers and to more effectively communicate the outcomes of our research (see below). While it is beyond the scope of this interim report to provide a detailed analysis of the external agencies’ measurement of impact, some broad themes can be highlighted.

The main theme that was common to all agencies was that the primary assessment of the excellence of a researcher’s *application is done by peer review at the committee level*. Thus, agency metrics are not imposed from above to the committee level. It is certainly true that “cultures of assessment” exist within agencies (see the comments about CIHR and SSAH researchers above), but these exist because of norms held by researchers in specific fields rather than agency-specific policies. The second common theme was that it is necessary to communicate the excellence of researchers and the *outcomes of their research* to stakeholders and the general public. This will be explored in more detail in the next section.

From that commonality, all else was variable. For the assessment of impact of outcomes, there appears to be a continuum of emphasis on bibliometrics/scientometrics, from the strong emphasis in CIHR and NSERC (see Table 1 of CIHR’s Roadmap and <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/documents/CIHR-strat-plan-eng.pdf>), through the highly variable emphasis in SSAH disciplines, to the Arts, where one informant talked about assessing “the value of mind”. It is broadly recognized that it is more difficult to express impact on the “softer” end of that continuum, but there are a number of efforts currently under way, including the controversial Research Excellence Framework (REF - <http://www.ref.ac.uk/>) from the UK, and Quality Metrics (<http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/what-we-do/research-and-data/quality-work/quality-metrics/>), also in the UK, and Culture Counts (<https://culturecounts.cc/about/>) in Australia.

SSHRC Commissioned a report on the use of bibliometrics in the social sciences in 2004 (Archambault and Gagné, 2004. The use of bibliometrics in the social sciences and humanities. Science Metrix – Final Report) which made several recommendations, including:

“Science-Metrix advises SSHRC to implement the following recommendations on the use and development of bibliometric tools for SSH research evaluation.

Recommendation 1. Assign bibliometrics-based mapping and evaluation work only to qualified entities. Organizations specializing in the use of bibliometrics are very familiar with the limitations of their tools and know how to interpret results with due care and caution. In particular, projects involving bibliometrics must entail explaining how the following variables affect study results:

- What types of publication (articles, books, etc.) are used in the discipline under consideration and what is the rate of coverage of these media in the information sources used?
- How are the indicators used in the study (count, citation/co-citation/co-word analysis, bibliographic coupling) affected by the internal variables of each discipline and the specific characteristics of the data sources used?

Recommendation 2. Promote research on determining the specific characteristics of SSH publication practices, and particularly on the following aspects:

- The proportion of the literature in each discipline represented by journal articles, monographs, book chapters, conference proceedings and other document types;
- The proportion of the literature in each discipline devoted to topics of more local interest and the proportion of research published in publications with limited distribution;
- The size and scope of the pool of citations from both books and articles.

Recommendation 3. Promote research on devising quantitative methods for identifying emerging fields and on methods for tracking their development.

Recommendation 4. (A) Promote research on understanding the influence of open access publications and self-archiving on trends and developments in SSH knowledge dissemination media; and (B) promote research on using data available through open access for research mapping and evaluation.

Recommendation 5. Play a proactive role in formatting data in the Common CV (CCV) System so that it can be used to map and evaluate Canadian research.” (pages 59-60).

Beyond the development of the CCV (which has not been universally received with enthusiasm), it is not clear how these efforts have proceeded in the intervening years.

The Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences has an ongoing project that seeks to develop a set of indicators that can measure the impact of SSAH research (see <http://www.ideas-idees.ca/blog/measuring-impact-social-sciences-and-humanities>). Their preliminary working paper was delivered in October 2014 (see <http://www.ideas-idees.ca/sites/default/files/2014-10-03-impact-project-draft-report-english-version-final2.pdf>). They propose that there are five broad areas where SSAH research has impact, and that these areas can be measured using “baskets” of indicators. These areas include scholarship, capacity, economy, society and culture and practice and policy. The entire agenda of the November 2015 Federation meeting was devoted to the measurement of impact in the SSAH (see http://www.ideas-idees.ca/sites/default/files/sites/default/uploads/general/2015/2015_annual_conference_agenda_en.pdf). The Federation intends to take up this significant issue in the upcoming year, with the goal of identifying, integrating, and coordinating insights from researchers, institutions, and organizations relevant to SSAH research (including but not limited to SSHRC).

Working Group 2 Activities

The working group has drafted an interview guide (consultation guide November 24 – attached to this report as Appendix D) to assist individual working group members in carrying out their consultations. We have also hired two research assistants to provide support as required for consultations.

Members of the working group have been carrying out consultations starting in early December. Consultations have taken a variety of formats, including individual interviews, group interviews, informal discussions, discussions at departmental and/or faculty council meetings, and consultation by email.

Members of the working group met on January 11th to discuss progress on consultations and to share strategies for participant recruitment. At that same meeting we discussed the format and content of the survey to be sent to faculty members. We also discussed the delivery of the survey. A draft survey was circulated to Working Group members on January 11th. Members reviewed the draft and provided feedback. The revised survey is attached to this report as Appendix E. A Qualtrics version of the revised survey will be produced and a link to the survey will be sent to the Dean of Research in each of the SSAH faculties (FIMS, Health Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, Education, Law, Music and Business). The SSAH Associate Deans of Research will circulate the link by email to all faculty members on January 18th, requesting feedback by January 28th.

Together, the results of faculty consultations and the online survey will provide comprehensive feedback from SSAH faculty regarding SSAH research on campus.

The Request for SSAH Metrics at Western

At the same time as this committee has been consulting with the SSAH community at Western, a request has been made from the Office of the VPR for the Associate Deans of Research to create “a list of research metrics in order to ensure...the most useful, actionable, metrics for planning and decision making” (October 28, 2015). It was not the objective of this committee to develop nor recommend a specific set of metrics. Rather the goal was to investigate how excellence was recognized at Western, being cognizant of the issues raised above that no single set of research indicators can adequately represent the range of SSAH disciplines. The work of this committee and the ADRs effort is proceeding separately, but in parallel.

3). How is SSAH research supported at Western, and how can that support be improved?

Working Group #3 deals with three related matters: administrative processes and practices for the allocation of internal research funding; the types of internal research funding available (small grant vs large grant; research costs; conference attendance, etc.) and how that has changed in recent years; and advocacy and communications regarding research achievements.

Administrative processes and practices

This is the most fundamental of the subjects in that it deals with the internal research grant process: e.g. applying through ROLA, the monitoring of grants, and regulations regarding payment for research assistants. Part of the goal here is to understand how the administrative processes function and whether any changes can be made to make them more user-friendly to researchers. It is also important to understand the perceptions that SSAH researchers have of the administrative process. Are the necessary supports in place for the kinds of research they do?

Internal funding mechanisms

Members of the working group are examining the evolution of internal funding mechanisms at Western, particularly after the changes introduced in 2011. With the help of Patrick Callaghan (RDS), we are collecting longitudinal data from ROLA regarding funding utilized by researchers in the SSAH (by department and faculty) to determine whether access to internal research funding has improved or worsened since 2011.

We are taking advantage of the broad consultations being undertaken by the other working groups to survey opinions on these matters. We are particularly interested in colleagues who have elected not to apply for any kind of research funding (internal or external), and their reasons. There are some researchers who simply do not need research funding and are productive and respected scholars. On the other hand, there are colleagues who believe that they are disadvantaged in any internal funding competitions, and that it is not a wise use of time to embark on the process of application.

Members of the working group are also surveying internal funding mechanisms at other universities to understand how SSAH scholarship is funded elsewhere. The goal here is to determine if there are any relevant practices that can be adopted and adapted at Western.

One corollary of the common emphasis on interdisciplinarity, collaborations and partnerships among the tricouncils (outlined in Section 1 above) is that the solitary scholar who requires smaller amounts of money to do their research is increasingly being left out of the funding equation. This issue was discussed at the SSHRC Leaders' meeting in Ottawa in December, and SSHRC may start to provide some guidance to institutions around the use of SSHRC Institutional Grant (SIG) funds to help to cover this gap.

Advocacy and communications regarding research achievements

The promotion and celebration of research achievements is a critical part of the research process. Researchers must feel that their work is valued by their institution and that research accomplishments in all disciplines are equally valued. Communicating research achievements is also critical because of the priority that funding bodies place on public engagement, knowledge mobilization, broader impact, and so on.

We are engaging in a comprehensive survey of communications to determine how decisions regarding advocacy are made, the relative priorities given to advocacy in certain faculties, and methods for improving an appreciation of the need for advocacy among SSAH researchers.

Finally, we are working towards a comprehensive measurement of communications over the last five years, to understand whether perception is grounded in reality. This is important because looking at individual cases is misleading. For example, of the "51 Firsts" listed on the Research Western website (see: http://www.uwo.ca/research/51_firsts/), only ten concern research in SSAH; forty-one relate to STEM research. On the other hand, of the eighteen stories highlighted by *Western News's* "Newsmakers of 2015", at least ten relate directly to SSAH research (see <http://news.westernu.ca/2015/12/westernnewsnewsmakers2015/>).

Communications Strategies for the External Agencies

As mentioned above, the external agencies are very keen to communicate the quality research being done by their researchers to stakeholders and the general public. According to CIHR "Impact - We will demonstrate the value and impact of our investments, we will engage Canadians, and we will ensure they are at the centre of our decisions." (<http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/49027.html>). Perhaps the most important aspect of the agencies' communications strategies is that they are ultimately *dependent on information provided by the researchers and institutions* – particularly project reports. Thus, the reports that many researchers view as onerous and burdensome are in fact the base of the chain of the communications effort by these agencies. The agencies are also constantly on the lookout for case studies to feature and media notes to highlight, so it behooves the researchers themselves as well as the University's communications team to be ready to provide such material when it is needed (see http://www.innovation.ca/sites/default/files/EOA/2013/CFI-CTP_Policy_Highlights_EN_web.pdf for a CFI example featuring Western researcher Ting Lee).

CFI is an example of an agency with a very well developed evaluations/communications system. They have a Director of Outcome Evaluation and, among other things, her office oversees the production of CFI's "PERAF" (Performance, Evaluation, Risk and Audit Framework) document (see <http://www.innovation.ca/en/OurInvestments/BeingAccountable/Performanceevaluationriskandauditfram>

[eworkPERAF](#)). This document and its review makes information available for management, accountability, and communication purposes. This document makes for a very interesting read.

SSHRC has opted to build the capacity for communications as an integral part of their strategic plan under the heading “Imagining Canada’s future” (see http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/society-societe/community-communite/Imagining_Canadas_Future-Imaginer_l_avenir_du_Canada-eng.aspx). In this initiative, SSHRC is positioning SSHRC research as being relevant to the Canada of today and the future. The initiative is focused around a series of six questions that were chosen to “spark the imaginations of researchers across the humanities and social sciences disciplines. We hope that researchers across Canada will see their fields broadly represented in these questions, and will be inspired to participate in a national conversation about the contributions that the humanities and social sciences can make to address the challenges of the future.” (see http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/society-societe/community-communite/Imagining_Canada_s_Future_Technical_Report-Rapport_technique_d_imaginer_l_avenir_du_Canada-eng.pdf)

At the grass roots level, our SSHRC informants commented that universities need to have better communications and advocacy strategies, including social media. This year, SSHRC will be working with the Canadian Association of Graduate Students to provide training for doctoral students in public presentations and the writing of op eds. This suggests that activities that would not normally be considered research indicators from the perspective of promotion and tenure, have value to the communication of research impact and knowledge mobilization in other forms (see the discussion of indicators above).

Summary

The activities of this task force are ongoing, particularly the consultation with the SSAH community at Western, so, as stated above, it is not the intent of this interim report to present specific recommendations at this time. Rather, the objective is to report on the activities of the three working groups and to frame the discussion within the external context. It is clear that the external context provides some direction for the ongoing discussions, and many of the themes outlined here will be useful for better informing our researchers, better positioning them to take advantage of opportunities and better supporting them through the application, execution and communication aspects of the research process.

Next Steps

The working groups will continue to flesh out the information presented in this report, and they will continue to consult with the SSAH community at Western. The input from researchers to the survey and interviews will be extremely important to achieving the mission of this task force. To that end, researchers at Western are encouraged to participate in the online survey and interviews, and to contribute any additional information by following the email link at:
http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/about/gov_review/urb_index.html

The final report of this task force will be completed in April, 2016 for delivery to the URB and to Senate in May/June.

Appendices

Appendix A - URB Task Force Steering Committee – Support for Research in Social Science, Arts and
Humanities at Western

Initial Report

A. Membership

The Task Force Steering Committee was formed by the University Research Board at the request of the Vice-President (Research) to examine how researchers in Social Science, Arts, and Humanities disciplines are supported at Western. URB appointed the following individuals as a steering committee to guide the work:

Andrew Nelson (Chair) ADR, Social Science (Anthropology)
Cathy Benedict Director of Research, Music
Jacquie Burkell ADR, FIMS
Julia Emberley Arts & Humanities (English)
Jonathan Vance Social Science (History)
Charles Weijer Arts & Humanities (Philosophy)

Since the steering committee was first formed, Julia Emberley has had to step down temporarily. We are recommending that she be replaced by Alison Doherty, Health Sciences (Kinesiology).

B. Mission & Objectives

The committee has met three times over the summer to discuss the mission and objectives of the review and to develop a work plan for moving forward, for which we are seeking URB's approval.

Mission

The social sciences, arts, and humanities are central to Western's vision and mission. Indeed, world-class researchers in these disciplines are found across the university in eight of Western's Faculties and Schools. Changes in both the internal and external contexts make it timely to examine how social science, arts, and humanities research is valued and funded. The Task Force will recommend strategies and concrete action plans that will better support success, growth and leadership in research in these disciplines at Western.

Objectives & Work Plan

The committee has identified three main areas to examine and, in consultation with URB and the ADRs, will constitute three working groups, one for each of the main objectives. Each working group will include at least one member from each of the eight Faculties in which social science, arts, and humanities research is conducted. Members of the steering committee have been assigned to act as coordinators for the working groups. Those coordinators have begun to design work plans that will be discussed in more detail at the URB meeting on September 8. A brief outline of each follows.

1. How do external entities, including funding agencies and professional organizations, define leading edge scholarly activity in social sciences, arts, and humanities disciplines?
 - a. What are their priorities now?
 - b. Where are they going in the next five years?

Andrew Nelson and Charles Weijer will coordinate the work in this area. As a first step, they will be consulting directly with the major funding agencies in Ottawa and professional organizations to fully understand the external context. Once that consultation is completed, the group will examine where Western fits currently and how it might best position itself for the future.

2. What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities of and threats to social sciences, arts, and humanities research at Western?

- a. How do units at Western define leading edge scholarly activity?
- b. How is research in the social sciences, arts, and humanities valued and measured at Western?
- c. How is research in the social sciences, arts, and humanities valued and measured outside of Western?
- d. In what ways are these values and measurements aligned with the external context?

Jacquie Burkell, Cathy Benedict and Charles Weijer will coordinate the work of this group. They will conduct a document review, and, in consultation with the ADRs, develop a list of individuals and groups with which to meet within each Faculty/School, recognizing that each unit deals with research issues differently. They have begun to develop a series of questions that may be put to individual researchers and groups and are considering whether to conduct a common survey of all researchers in the social sciences, arts, and humanities disciplines at Western. They will also take part in a town hall to be held later in the fall to which all researchers in the related disciplines will be invited.

3. How is research in the social sciences, arts, and humanities supported at Western and how can this be improved?

- a. Specifically, how can (i) administrative practices and processes, (ii) funding, and (iii) recognition be improved?
- b. How can Western better communicate the results of leading edge scholarly activities in social sciences, arts, and humanities disciplines?
- c. How can Western advocate for social sciences, arts, and humanities research more effectively?

Jonathan Vance and Andrew Nelson will coordinate the work of this group. The individuals to be consulted across campus will vary depending on the question. For example, a review of administrative practices and processes will require targeted consultations with those in Research Development Services who do the work that supports those processes; understanding communication and promotion of research activity will require consultation with the Department of Communications and Public Affairs, staff in individual Faculties with responsibility for promotion and celebration of research, and individuals at other universities to understand best practices here and elsewhere. The group will also want to understand how researchers promote and communicate their own work and how they can be encouraged to do that more effectively. With respect to examining the various internal funding programs, discussion with the full research community via the town hall would be appropriate.

C. Communications and Outreach

The information gathering strategy adopted by this taskforce includes the targeted communications and outreach described above, and a single town hall event for all interested researchers to attend. The current plan is to hold that meeting in early to mid-October. Discussions for other means of gathering input are still under way.

A web page - http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/about/gov_review/urb_index.html - has been set up for the Task Force that will provide updates from time to time on the work of the committee, scheduled meetings, questions for comment, etc.

Once the URB has approved the mission, objectives and work plan for the task force, a broad communication will be sent to all researchers about the task force's work with an invitation for input. A dedicated email address (urb-task-force@uwo.ca) has been established for the task force to which individuals or groups can provide comments.

An interim report will be provided to the VPR by mid-January for presentation to the URB at their meeting in February. A final report will be presented in early April.

Appendix B - URB Task force working group membership

#1 – what is the external (to Western) context for SSAH research?

- Andrew Nelson, Charles Weijer, Cathy Benedict
 - Alan Leschied (Education), Jim Davies (FSS), Jeff Dixon (Schulich), Joshua Lambier (student A&H), Sam Trosow (FIMS/Law), Janice Forsyth (FHS)

#2 – How is SSAH research valued at Western, and how does Western recognize leading edge scholarly activity in the SSAH disciplines?

- Jacquie Burkell, Cathy Benedict, Charles Weijer
 - June Cotte (Business), Jessica Polzer (Health Sciences), Amanda Grzyb (FIMS), Valerie Oosterveld (Law), Stephen Bird (Education), Chris Brown (Arts and Humanities), Don Abelson (Social Science), Leslie Kinton (Music), Diana Moriera (student member, FSS)

#3 – How is SSAH research supported at Western, and how can that support be improved?

- Jonathan Vance, Andrew Nelson
 - Kelly Olson (A&H), Tamara Hinan (student, FSS), Vicki Schwean (Education), Scott MacDonald (student FIMS), Jane Toswell (A&H)

The research assistants are: Jaclyn Nardone (FIMS) and Crystal Gaudet (Health Sciences).

Appendix C - External Agencies and Individuals Consulted

The task force gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the following individuals and organizations:

Canada Research Chairs - Marie-Lynne Boudreau, Senior Program Officer

CFI - Laurent Messier, Manager, John R. Evans Leaders Fund

- Mireille Labrie, Senior Programs Officer
- Sharyn Szick, Senior Programs Officer, responsible for Western University
- Laura Hillier, Director of Outcome Evaluation

CIHR - Jane Aubin, Vice-President, Research, Knowledge Translation and Ethics Portfolio and Chief Scientific Officer

Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences

- Gauri Sreenivasan, Director of Policy and Programs
- Peter Severinson, Policy Analyst

Canada Council for the Arts - Kelly Wilhelm – Head, Policy, Planning and Partnership Section

- Gabriel Zamfir, Senior Research Officer, Research and Evaluation Section
- Alexis Andrew, Director, Research, Evaluation and Performance Measurement Section

NCE - André Isabelle, Associate Vice-President of the Networks of Centres of Excellence

NSERC - Pierre Charest, Vice-President, Research Grants and Scholarships Directorate

SSHRC - Tim Wilson, Director Partnerships

- Jean-Francois Fortin, Director Research, Training portfolio
- Ursula Gobel, Associate Vice President, Imagining Canada's Future
- Brent Herbert-Copley, Executive Vice President
- Ted Hewitt, President

Appendix D - Final Consultation/Interview Guide

Preamble:

As part of the Senate Research Board Task Force examining the environment around Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities (SSAH) research at Western, we are conducting individual/group consultations with faculty members. This consultation process is distinct from the discussions of “metrics” that have been initiated recently at the faculty-level. The findings of our university-wide consultations will be amalgamated into a report and will form the basis for recommendations to the Senate Research Board on SSAH research at Western. Specific individuals, departments, schools and faculties will not be identified in the report and all information provided is anonymous and confidential. Thank you for your input. Your insights to the SSAH research environment at Western are invaluable.

Background:

- Review background and purpose of consultation and distinguish consultation from conversations about Metrics happening at faculty level.

Introductory questions:

- To start, tell me a bit about your research. What do you study?
- What contributions does your research make? And to whom/what communities does your work contribute?

1. Supports

- What supports are most important for your research?
 - [prompts: people, administration, financial, recognition]
- What sources of support have you received for your research at Western?
 - [prompts: people, administration, financial, recognition]
- What do you think of the current internal funding programs at Western (Strategic Support for Success programs, FRDF programs)
- Have you applied for these programs? Why/why not? (If yes) Have you been successful? Why/why not?
- How has the shift in internal funding programs at Western affected your research?
 - [prompts: shift from ADF large/small research grants and SSHRC Internal Research and Conference grants to FRDF and Strategic Support for Success programs]
- If you could start fresh, what would you like to see in Western’s internal funding programs?

2. Challenges

- What challenges have you faced doing your research at Western?
 - [prompts: within your dept./school/faculty; people, administration, money, recognition, strategic plan, ethics, other?]
- How unique do you think these challenges are in comparison to those that other SSAH researchers face at Western? How could these challenges be addressed?
- How have you managed to continue your research in the face of these challenges?
- Are there specific processes or procedures at Western that are challenges to doing your research?

3. Opportunities:

- How could your research be better supported at Western?
 - [prompts: financial, recognition, administration, promotion, other]
- What could be done to better support SSAH research at Western more generally?
- How can we better communicate the contributions and successes of SSAH research within and beyond academia?

4. Threats:

- What future do you see for SSAH research at Western?
- What future do you see for your research at Western?

5. Assessing the Value of SSAH at Western:

- How do you define 'leading edge' research? Provide examples of leading edge research activity in your field.
- What is valued about SSAH research at Western?
- What about your research is valued at Western? How do you know that?
- Do existing assessment processes (e.g., APE) capture the value of your research?
- How can the value of your research be captured?
 - [prompt – processes, assessment formats]

Appendix E - Faculty Survey - Social Science, Arts, and Humanities Research At Western

Thank you for taking the time to give us your opinions about social science, arts, and humanities research at Western. This confidential survey is part of an ongoing faculty consultation process that will report back to the University Research Board and Senate on the research climate for social science, arts, and humanities research at Western. If you would like to read about the mission and terms of this task force, please see more here:

http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/about/gov_review/urb_index.html

This survey should take between 10-15 minutes of your time, and we thank you in advance for participating!

PAGE BREAK IN THE SURVEY

To begin, please give us your thoughts on the *support for conducting your research* at Western. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 designates Strongly Disagree and 5 designates Strongly Agree, please tell us your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

THE SCALE POINTS WILL RUN ACROSS THE TOP, AND EACH QUESTION WILL HAVE A “DON’T KNOW” OPTION AVAILABLE.

- 1) I receive the necessary *staff administrative support* I need to conduct and complete my research.
- 2) I receive the necessary *external financial support* I need to conduct and complete my research.
- 3) The support for my research from *my faculty* level administrators is adequate.
- 4) The support for my research from *university* level administrators is adequate.
- 5) The graduate students I need to conduct and complete my research are available to me.
- 6) The availability of *internal* funding for my research is adequate.
- 7) The staff assistance in applying for *internal* funding is adequate for my research needs.
- 8) The process for applying for *internal* funding at Western is easy to understand.
- 9) The staff assistance in applying for *external* funding at Western is adequate for my research needs.
- 10) The process for applying for *external* funding at Western is easy to understand.

PAGE BREAK IN THE SURVEY

For the following questions, please check all that apply.

11) What sources of support have you received for your research at Western?

- a. Financial
- b. Administrative/staff
- c. Graduate student assistance
- d. Publicity/external communication of your research

12) What kinds of support would you have liked to receive, but did not, at Western?

- a. Financial
- b. Administrative/staff
- c. Graduate student assistance
- d. Publicity/external communication of your research

PAGE BREAK IN THE SURVEY

13) Please tell us, from a support standpoint, what has made the biggest positive impact on your research at Western? Why?

OPEN-ENDED

14) Please tell us your thoughts on the internal funding program at Western. Does it meet your needs? If you were to change it, how would you do so?

OPEN-ENDED

PAGE BREAK IN THE SURVEY

Now, please give us your thoughts on the *challenges with conducting your own research* at Western. On the same scale from 1 to 5, where 1 designates Strongly Disagree and 5 designates Strongly Agree, please tell us your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements. If you have faced challenges, we would like to know what they are, so there will be follow-up open-ended responses.

THE SCALE POINTS WILL RUN ACROSS THE TOP, AND EACH QUESTION WILL HAVE A “DON’T KNOW” OPTION AVAILABLE.

- 15) I have faced challenges from within my own department or faculty, related to conducting my research.
- 16) I have faced challenges at the University level, related to conducting my research.
- 17) I have faced financial challenges at Western, related to conducting my research.
- 18) I have faced challenges in receiving recognition for the research I conduct.
- 19) Western’s Strategic Plan presents challenges for me, and my program of research.
- 20) I have faced challenges obtaining research ethics approvals at Western, related to conducting my research.

****NOTE: For questions 15-20 inclusive, if someone answers 3 or higher, please add an open-ended follow-up question: “Please tell us more about these challenges.”.**

On the same scale from 1 to 5, where 1 designates Strongly Disagree and 5 designates Strongly Agree, please tell us your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

- 21) Social sciences, arts, and humanities research at Western should have better financial support.
- 22) It is a good idea to focus Western’s internal funding priorities on helping faculty apply for Tri-Council grants.
- 23) Western’s internal funding for social science, arts, and humanities research should focus on smaller amounts of money for a greater number of researchers, rather than larger amounts of money for a smaller number of researchers.
- 24) The current method of allocating internal research funds at Western is appropriate.
- 25) Social sciences, arts, and humanities research at Western has to have better recognition from the university.
- 26) Social sciences, arts, and humanities research at Western has to have better promotion for visibility outside the university.

PAGE BREAK IN THE SURVEY

27) Please tell us which faculty you are in at Western.

Arts & Humanities
Education
FIMS
Health Sciences
Ivey Business School
Law
Music
Social Science

PAGE BREAK IN THE SURVEY

28) Please tell us your rank at Western.

Full Professor
Associate Professor
Assistant Professor
Lecturer/Adjunct
Other

If you have any further comments or questions for the task force, please email us at:

urb-task-force@uwo.ca