Awards & Funding

- There are funding opportunities throughout the year. They are announced in the ISGP newsletter or on ISGP email lists.
- Vanier, Trudeau, Tri-agencies (SSHRC / NSERC / CIHR) and UBC Affiliated Fellowship are major funding opportunities with deadlines in September every year.
- More information on finding funding and writing successful grant proposal: https://www.grad.ubc.ca/current-students/scholarships-awards-funding/resources-award-applicants

Why Research Proposals Are Rejected*
by Don Thackrey
*(adapted from) University of Michigan Proposal Writer's Guide

The following is a chapter from the University of Michigan *Proposal Writer's Guide* by Don Thackrey. You may view it online at: http://www.drda.umich.edu/proposals/pwg/pwgrejected.html

Different reviewers, of course, will weigh merits and defects differently, but the following list of short-comings of 605 proposals rejected by the National Institutes of Health is worth pondering. The list is derived from an article by Dr. Ernest M. Allen (Chief of the Division of Research Grants, National Institutes of Health) that appeared in Science, Vol. 132 (November 25, 1960), pp. 1532-34.

A. The <u>problem</u> (58 percent)…
1. …is not of sufficient importance or is unlikely to produce any new or useful information.
2. …rests on insufficient evidence, is doubtful, or is unsound
3. …is more complex than the investigator appears to realize
4. …is nebulous and diffuse and without a clear research aim
5. …the research as proposed is overly involved, with too many elements

B. The <u>methods</u> (73 percent)…
1. …are unsuited to the stated objective
2. …and the design are too nebulous, diffuse, and lacking in clarity to permit adequate evaluation
3. …have not been carefully thought out
4. …and the data analysis have not been given sufficient consideration

C. The student (55 percent)…
1. …does not have adequate experience or training for this research
2. …appears to be unfamiliar with recent pertinent literature or methods
3. …The student needs better supervision in this field or in collateral fields

Applying for fellowships: Who does what?

While there will be differences in application materials and what you will send to whom, you may follow what is outlined here as a general guideline. Please refer to The Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies (G+PS) website and the award granting agency websites for specific information. For Example, please note: <u>PhD</u> students applying for a CIHR award will apply directly to CIHR online. These students will not undergo the internal review and ranking process.

The student	The supervisor	The ISGP Chair	The ISGP FAC	The ISGP office
1. Outlines his/her proposal 2. Shares the outline with his/her co-supervisors 3. With this feedback s/he writes the first draft of the proposal and 4. Shares the draft with their co-supervisors. 5. With this feedback the student writes the second (final) draft. 6. Arranges for all transcripts and letters of reference to be forwarded to the ISGP office.	1. Discusses the student's research interests. 2. Reviews the student's outline and gives feedback. 3. Reviews the student's draft proposal and gives feedback. 4. Writes a letter of support for the student's proposal. 5. The letter *must not be identical* to the letter of recommendation for the student's admission to ISGP. 6. The letter must make specific reference to the student's research question and proposed methodology.	1. Is available for consultation with students and co-supervisors. 2. Can review proposals before they are complete. 3. Will review supervisors' letters of recommendation. 4. Brings all applications to the ISGP Faculty Advisory Committee. 5. Writes the departmental letters of recommendation. 6. Provides feedback to all students.	1. The FAC reads, reviews, adjudicates and ranks all proposals.	1. The office compiles all materials and ensures that all applications are complete. 2. Provides electronic copies of all materials to all FAC members. 3. Takes minutes of the FAC meeting.