The Grant Assist Program [GaP] is an initiative of the Office of the Vice-President (Research), begun in 2011 for researchers applying to Canadian Institutes of Health Research [CIHR]. Support specifically targeted for humanities and social sciences faculty members was piloted in the spring of 2013. The goal of the Social Sciences and Humanities Grant Assist Program [SS&H GaP] is to support researchers applying to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and to improve the calibre of grants submitted. The SS&H GaP offers peer mentoring, feedback processes, bridge funding, workshops, information panels, grant editing, research assistants, access to sample successful grants and other resources.

This document summarizes responses to a survey conducted in late August and early September 2015. The purpose of the survey was to evaluate the SS&H GaP as it transitions from pilot to standing program. The survey was sent to 387 continuing faculty members who have had any contact with the SS&H GaP since 2013. 123 responses were received [32% response rate].

Section 1: Awareness of the range of GaP services:
The graph summarizes awareness of SS&H GAP offerings among the respondents.

**Figure 1: Awareness of SS&H GAP Offerings**

**Notes:**
- Mentoring: eg. One on one strategy meeting with the GAP’s Senior Coordinator; post-results detailed review of a failed application; detailed written/email correspondence about your proposal.
- Workshops: eg. Altmetrics Research Impact Workshops, CCV-Bees
- Bridge Funding: eg: Partnership LOI preparation grant; GAP 4A bridge funding
- Panel Presentations: eg: Aboriginal Research, Open Access, Research-Creation; Knowledge Mobilization; Lemons to Lemonade
- SSHRC Success Stories - annual event honouring SSHRC researchers, usually held in November
- <sshrcUofA> Listserv for SSHRC Researchers at UAlberta
- GAP Website Resource Centre - tips on grant success, budget-crafting, etc.
- Preferences Polls - re: workshops, retreats, application support needs, etc.
- GAP SS&H document repository in the ERA documents housed in the Libraries’ Education and Research Archive
Section 2: Satisfaction with GaP services
The graphs below summarize satisfaction with SS&H GAP services.

![Figure 2: Satisfaction with GAP Services]

Legend:
a=Dissatisfied; b=Satisfied; c=Highly Satisfied;  
d=N/A (did not access this);  
e=Did not access this, but think it’s worthwhile
Section 3: Opinions regarding the GaP SS&H key services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The SS&amp;H GAP should be maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SS&amp;H GAP should be expanded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Research Assistant was helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Professional Editor improved my proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Peer Reviewer’s critical feedback made my proposal stronger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Senior Coordinator was knowledgeable and supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will participate in future GAP activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend GAP to my colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a Peer Reviewer, I was treated with respect and felt my contribution was valued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4: Narrative Feedback

Respondents were asked to comment on any aspect of the Social Sciences and Humanities’ Grant Assist Program (SS&H GaP). Analysis was performed on 58 narrative comments received from 123 total survey respondents. Bullet points (●) highlight and paraphrase specific comments. The percentage of mention is shown followed by the number of mentions in square brackets. Comments are listed from highest to lowest mention.

➢ The SS&H GAP Initiative – 22% [13]
  • Great/fantastic and very useful and valuable initiative for the research community.
  • Very satisfied with the services – have contributed positively to my research program including successful applications.
  • SS&H GAP has contributed to the creation of networks and collaboration amongst colleagues.

➢ SS&H GAP Peer Review Process – 22% [13]
  • Reviewer’s Perspective:
    o Reviewers should not feel pressured to participate and should only be included if they’ve used the program.
    o Occasionally grants were not developed well enough for peer review.
    o Important to encourage applicants to prepare well in advance of deadlines.
    o Membership in the Academy of Reviewers is rewarding.
SS&H GAP Peer Review Process [cont’d]
• Applicant’s Perspective:
  o Important to encourage volunteerism to review amongst faculty.
  o Applications matched to appropriate disciplines give the most effective review.
  o Peer review is very important and helpful.
  o Made changes to my application as a result of peer review.
  o Reviewers have not kept up-to-date on changes and could not comment on new sections.

The SS&H GAP Senior Coordinator – 19% [11]
• Invaluable, personal, detailed, dedicated, sympathetic and effective in her role.
• Provides great advice around increasing visibility of research.
• Ability to connect researchers to one another and disseminate information.
• Knowledgeable about funding opportunities, processes, and social sciences and arts fields.

SS&H GAP workshops/seminars/lectures – 16% [9]
• The workshops are excellent, helpful and contribute to success.
• Workshops focusing on tips and strategies versus explaining rules would be useful.
• The Alt Metrics session and SSHRC visits are useful.

Successful Grants Library – 10% [6]
• Appreciate the grants library and feel it is critical to success.
• More awareness about the grants library is needed.
• Expansion of the database to include more Insight Development Grant proposals.

SS&H GAP Grant Writing Club – 10% [6]
• Too much of a time commitment.
• The writing club was helpful and I appreciated it.

SS&H GAP Editing Service – 10% [6]
• Editing assistance was valuable and important.
• Editing assistance helped me secure funding.
• I would use editing support again.
• The editor was not qualified.

The SS&H Grant Assist Program (GAP) versus the Research Services Office (RSO) – 8.7% [5]
• As RSO is increasingly overloaded, GAP is able to provide supports that may otherwise be missed.
• GAP and RSO provide complementary support - scholarly and administrative, respectively – and both are units are needed.
• RSO, specifically Kerri Calvert and Chelsey Van Weerden, have previously provided positive support for SSHRC applications. Their support is missing and not fulfilled by GAP.

SS&H GAP Communications – 8.6% [5]
• Information that is disseminated about SSHRC grants is important as it is not always forwarded by my Department.
• Some information disseminated through listserv is not applicable – too many emails.
• The information is difficult to find.
• The website is useful.
- **Timelines of the SS&H GAP Services – 6.9% [4]**
  - Email reminders of grant review well in advance of deadlines to participate would be appreciated.
  - Application reviews could be scheduled outside of times when teaching obligations are heavy.

- **SS&H GAP Writers Retreat – 6.9% [4]**
  - The retreat was useful with lots of valuable information.

- **Recommendation of the SS&H GAP Services – 5.2% [3]**
  - Recommended by other faculty and to other faculty.

- **4A Bridge Funding – 5.2% [3]**
  - The 4A bridge funding was beneficial.
  - The 4A bridge funding could be extended to more researchers based on close scores when success rate at SSHRC are low.
  - Would like 4A funding available more than once.

- **Expanding Support of the SS&H GAP – 5.2% [3]**
  - Expand to support beyond the Insight Development Grant (IDG) or Insight Grant (IG).
  - Should be expanded and extended.

- **SS&H GAP Outcome Measures – 5.2% [3]**
  - Would be helpful to know if the SS&H GAP services have increased success rate.

- **Miscellaneous Comments – mentioned <2 times**
  - Increased cash support from the University of Alberta would increase competitiveness.
  - Providing clear and simple models for budgets.
  - Faculty should receive more recognition (beyond FEC) for contributions to SS&H GAP.
  - Research Assistant was helpful with CCV.
  - Departments and Faculties could play a great role in supporting writing and submission of grants, particularly innovative and creative SSHRC proposals.
  - SS&H GAP mentorship was key to my success.
  - The Success Stories Event was disappointing – celebrated the success of few versus all those that have been successful.
Section 5
Demographic Information

Respondents were asked to volunteer information as to their main faculty affiliation and duration of employment at the University of Alberta. 91% of the respondents provided their demographic information.

**Figure 4: Response by Faculty**

- Arts: 54%
- Education: 13%
- Nursing: 1%
- Extension: 3%
- Campus St-Jean: 2%
- Augustana: 7%
- ALES: 4%
- Business: 7%
- Rehabilitation Medicine: 1%
- Science: 4%
- Physical Education & Recreation: 3%
- Pharmacy: 1%
- Nursing: 1%

**Figure 5: Employment (years)**

- More than 20 years
- 11 - 20 years
- 5 - 10 years
- Less than 5 years