



Office of the Vice-President Research

University of Saskatchewan
Box 5000 RPO University, 110 Gymnasium Place
Saskatoon SK S7N 4J8 Canada
Phone: (306) 966-5516 Fax: (306) 966-5951
Email: peter.stoicheff@usask.ca

University of Saskatchewan Report on SSHRC's Transformation Proposals

April 29, 2004

Peter Stoicheff (English)

1. The Consultation Process at the University of Saskatchewan
 2. SSHRC's Transformation Proposals and the University of Saskatchewan's Research Profile
 3. How SSHRC's Transformation Goals can best Support and Encourage Research at the University of Saskatchewan
 - 3.1: Aboriginal Research
 - 3.2: Issues Related to Community-Based Research
 - 3.2.1 Community-Based Health Research,
 - 3.2.2 Interdisciplinary Confederations and Institutes
 - 3.3: Connecting SSHRC's Transformation Proposals with Specific Research Needs at the University of Saskatchewan
 - 3.3.1: SSHRC Institutional Grants
 - 3.3.2: Current Funding Formula for Doctoral Fellowships
 - 3.3.3: Other Proposals for Transforming Graduate Student Funding
 - 3.4: Responses to other SSHRC Transformation Proposals
 - 3.4.1: "The Human Sciences"
 - 3.4.2: The Importance of the Standard Research Grant Program
 - 3.4.3: Role of CFHSS
 - 3.4.4: Release Time Stipends
 - 3.4.5: The New Research/ Creation Grants
 4. Conclusions and Recommendations
- Appendix A: Consultations List

1. The Consultation Process at the University of Saskatchewan

In December, 2003 Vice-President Research Steven Franklin appointed Peter Stoicheff (Department of English) as the University of Saskatchewan's representative for SSHRC's Transformation process. The role essentially involved acting as a liaison between SSHRC and this university's SSHRC research community and administration for the planned five-month consultation period, February to June 2004. During this period, the University of Saskatchewan would be informed of the details of SSHRC's proposals for its future transformation and SSHRC, in turn, would receive a response to those proposals from the University of Saskatchewan, primarily in the form of this report.

The consultation process began at the University of Saskatchewan in early February, immediately after a January 31st information meeting in Toronto with SSHRC administration and other Canadian university SSHRC Transformation representatives. The consultations involved meetings on campus with many levels of University administration, many Council and other committees, and with SSHRC researchers and graduate students. SSHRC President Marc Renaud and Pamela Wiggin (Vice-President, Knowledge Products and Mobilization) visited the campus for consultative meetings on March 11th with community-based researchers and university research partners, with faculty and graduate students, and with the Editorial Board of the *Saskatoon StarPhoenix*. Later meetings took place off campus with university-related groups. A website (<http://www.usask.ca/research/sshrc/transformation.shtml>) was created that describes in detail the consultation process, provides background information on the SSHRC Transformation initiative, contains minutes of those meetings, and provides a "response" page to gather reactions to SSHRC's proposals from University of Saskatchewan faculty, administration and graduate student perspectives. Appendix A contains a full list of committees, groups and individuals consulted.

The Transformation proposals responded to, and the responses themselves, varied greatly among the disciplines, individuals, committees and groups consulted. Some themes emerged that were common to almost all of these sectors of the University. Differences of opinion also emerged, in some cases based on the varieties of disciplinary procedures and goals represented at the University of Saskatchewan, in other cases based on divergent individual assumptions concerning the role of the intellectual in Canadian society and of SSHRC's function in relation to that role. SSHRC's overall initiative to transform itself from a "Granting Council" to a "Knowledge Council" was favourably regarded as a necessary step in improving funding for the Social Sciences and Humanities research communities. However, while many of SSHRC's specific proposals for change were seen as positive means for encouraging and assisting research activity at the University, others were seen as distorting natural modes of already well-functioning intellectual inquiry.

This report attempts to reflect the spirit and substance of such responses. However, many of them are shared by other disciplinary units across the country, in the form of Congress societies, university departments, and individual researchers. Many have been expressed already in reports to SSHRC that have circulated among society members for comment and response. Many are articulated in reports from other universities, and were in fact anticipated and clearly expressed at the Toronto meeting of SSHRC Transformation representatives in late January. Many were communicated at a March 26-27 meeting in Ottawa with SSHRC executive and presidents of scholarly associations within the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences. Many were also communicated directly to SSHRC President Renaud and Vice-President Wiggin during their March 11 visit to this University by faculty and graduate students.

As a result, this report emphasizes responses that address the University of Saskatchewan's unique set of research activities, challenges and aspirations. A most significant theme in the responses involves how a transformed SSHRC, as expressed in its *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council* documents and during the consultation period, realizes, contradicts, encourages or impedes the unique research culture at the University of Saskatchewan. This University has been re-defining and clarifying its own identity as a tier-one Canadian research institution; it is important for its research community, and for SSHRC itself, to regard SSHRC's Transformation proposals in the timely context of this University's own recent proposals for change and growth. Most significant among these are SSHRC's, and the University's, emphases on Aboriginal research and education; on research that is relevant to the public

and involves university partners; and on research that is collaborative across disciplines, communities and institutions and among faculty researchers and students.

2. SSHRC's Transformation Proposals and the University of Saskatchewan's Research Profile

The University of Saskatchewan's SSHRC-related research community is unique in Canada in its number and variety of disciplines, units, centres and colleges. Researchers eligible for SSHRC funding are in the colleges of Arts and Science (including the Humanities, Social Sciences and Fine Arts), Education, Law, Kinesiology, Commerce, Medicine and Agriculture; in centres such as the Centre for the Study of Co-Operatives, the Indigenous Peoples Health Research Centre, and the Native Law Centre; in units such as the Humanities Research Unit; in Departments as diverse as Epidemiology, Agricultural Economics, Educational Foundations, English, History, Management and Marketing, Native Studies and Art History. Such diversity has lately come to be regarded less as an impediment to resource allocation than as an opportunity for the kind of inter- and cross-disciplinary collaborative research that SSHRC proposes to foster. The University's recent "Integrated Plan" underlines the importance of research being conducted through centres that connect disciplines in fruitful collaboration: "it is no longer feasible or sensible to regard research centers as peripheral to the activities of the university; instead, these centers should assume greater prominence within larger research networks."

Similarly, the University has a strong tradition in the community-based research SSHRC hopes to encourage through its proposals for increased partnering and a greater public presence. Its Centre for the Study of Co-Operatives is presently conducting SSHRC-funded research on social cohesion and co-operative membership that involves 15 co-investigators across nine Canadian universities in seven disciplines and over 20 community-based partner organizations. Its CUISR research has funded 81 community research projects, in the process shifting the attitudes of local communities toward research and encouraging them to use research to influence and shape the lives of their people. The success of community-based projects such as these has led to an increased recognition by community members of SSHRC-funded projects and of the public and practical relevance of university research.

These and many other community-related research activities here have emerged not so much from SSHRC's recent encouragement of university-community connections, nor from the current pressures to secure Tri-Council funding that affect all universities, but from this University's traditional ideal of service to its provincial and local communities. The Transformation goals of linking scholarship with human needs, meeting public demands for accountability, helping surrounding communities thrive and prosper, and promoting various forms of public outreach are already genuine parts of this University's vision. They are echoed in the fact that the *StarPhoenix* is one of only two newspapers in the country that places a reporter at the university. They are achieved not only through community-related research but by regarding the classroom as a primary location for research results to be communicated and spread beyond the university, a principle articulated in the University's commitments to the Teacher-Scholar model and to its "sense of place."

The twin pillars of SSHRC's proposed Transformation – greater collaborative and interdisciplinary research, and greater public impact – are thus consistent with the University of Saskatchewan's research aspirations and, to a certain extent, accomplishments. This is partly a function of the University's geographical placement (distant from other universities, it attempts to offer its students a full array of programs) and partly a function of its, and Saskatoon's, size (it occupies a central role physically, conceptually and economically in its city).

3: How SSHRC's Transformation Goals can best Support and Encourage Research at the University of Saskatchewan

If the goals articulated in SSHRC's Transformation proposals in these ways complement and underscore those already existing at the University of Saskatchewan, several fundamental questions arise. One is: how can SSHRC's new vision be designed and practised to best suit the needs of this University's research community which, despite the consistency between its goals and those proposed by SSHRC, does not yet achieve the national average of SSHRC funding success? Another is: to what extent do SSHRC's Transformation proposals hinder rather than assist realizing the common research objectives that it and this institution share? A third is: how can SSHRC's Transformation vision be realized in such a way that a university of this size, this location, and this set of mandates is not newly disenfranchised from the tier-one national research standard it hopes to achieve and maintain, but instead is assisted in doing so? As one group of respondents put it, "in the competition for a limited envelope of funds, will the real names within the bubbles on the "SSHRC Tomorrow" diagram (*From Granting Council to Knowledge Council*, 1: 20) be University of Toronto, McGill, University of Alberta, University of British Columbia and so on?"

In essence, it is of vital importance that this University be able to look to SSHRC for leadership in continuing to develop and legitimate the institution's and the Council's complementary goals. What follows is a set of conclusions and recommendations for ensuring that SSHRC's Transformation proposals continue to support and encourage the University of Saskatchewan's research culture.

3.1: Aboriginal Research:

In its many foundational documents the University is committed to developing and supporting Aboriginal research, to promoting collaboration among the various units, centres, colleges and departments that house such research, and to extending the results of that research throughout the University and beyond. As its recent Integrated Planning document puts it, "the Province of Saskatchewan has a growing and important Aboriginal sector with attendant teaching and research needs" ("U of S Integrated Plan", April 9 draft: 14). The University intends to be a national and international leader in the areas of Aboriginal research and teaching and thus the recent pilot program for Aboriginal Research is an important component of SSHRC's future support for researchers here. It is regarded by some as a "wonderful piece of nuanced yet firm and potentially transformative leadership" that will "help address the deficits and distortions in public understanding of Indigenous difference and Indigenous knowledge and some of the unachieved promises of Treaty Federalism for all Canadians." At the same time, SSHRC's leadership in this area is ahead of most post-secondary institutions in Canada, and thus it needs to "follow up its leadership with concerted effort to bring universities and colleges along in their thinking." One way of doing this is to seek the assistance of successful participants in its pilot project. Another is to enhance its Aboriginal academic presence and capacity, and to continue its commitment to the kinds of exchange that led to its new initiative.

The new SSHRC Aboriginal Research initiative requires the involvement of members of Aboriginal communities (particularly elders) in the peer review process and of Aboriginal students in the research conducted. While these are laudable guidelines, Aboriginal elders are pulled in multiple directions, and the relevance of the research to their communities is not always clear. Too, the traditional academic modes of communication such as monographs and journal articles are often inappropriate to the communities that have fostered their production. Working with an Aboriginal community involves many new challenges, and a sharp learning curve, for most researchers: these challenges include the issue of community vs. individual consent; the need for terms of reference for Indigenous community research; and the necessity of, and time involved in, building genuine trust within the community. The education, team building and consent requirements at each level of Aboriginal government (tribal councils, health authorities, etc.) mean that the process is involved and time-consuming, yet it is imperative both that communities be included as equal partners in each stage of the process and that principles of sound research not be compromised. Research of this kind simply does not proceed at the pace of archive-based, or of statistical, traditional academic research.

Early identification of what both partners want and the negotiation of the final project based on respect for mutual needs is a first step in university-community rapport and can help in this regard. One suggestion was to create a Request for Application indexed to Aboriginal research only that addresses the priority research issues that communities would like to see addressed. This RFA should be offered regionally, so that university researchers in that region can identify what the community needs are and contact those communities with interests complementary to their own. This early contact would facilitate the construction of a research project that addresses the needs of each partner in its beginning stages. Another suggestion was to fund regional forums that “will provide an understanding of what constitutes community needs and a template in terms of how Aboriginal communities like to be engaged. This will eventually reduce administrative time surrounding grant applications. These forums should be considered for funding under the Development Grant criteria. If SSHRC is flexible, a short term solution might be to have longer deadlines than might be the case for research that doesn’t involve aboriginal populations.”

Similarly, community coordinators (Aboriginal individuals residing in the community) could be engaged as liaisons between their communities and university researchers. They could access (as a legitimate budget expenditure under SSHRC submission criteria) Aboriginal Health Research Workshops to be held in Saskatchewan, as well as research education programs and other opportunities.

Finally, as one respondent put it, if the communities and the researchers are to be equal partners, “some of the funds should reside in the community rather than reside exclusively at an institution. This is an issue of trust and something that community coordinators could have administrative authority over. Current Tri-Council protocol stipulates that the money resides in a university or non-university institute where Aboriginal partners feel no ownership of or control over it. There will be a need for Tri-Council policy on this and SSHRC can be a leader here. The question will be ‘to what extent can we put this money into host communities without government regulation?’ CIHR, for example, does not monitor its funds closely once they are awarded, so this is not a huge departure in policy.”

3.2 Issues Related to Community-Based Research:

It is important to recognize that community-based research is frequently on-going: its procedures take a long time; in the case of Aboriginal research, building trust takes a long time; the dynamics of working with any community, Aboriginal or not, mean that a relationship has been established that cannot summarily be curtailed once the research is “done”. Thus, a mechanism for providing a consistent funding stream is needed – if funding is always considered to be on a one-time basis, the perception of community-based research by partners and communities outside the university will suffer accordingly, and SSHRC’s Transformation goal of greater public impact will, in this context, not be realized.

If funding for community-based research is going to be sustained, mechanisms for evaluating and measuring the value of projects will become increasingly necessary. One performance indicator would be the extent to which the research project has attracted funding from other agencies, governments or related organizations. Another would involve developing a mechanism for feedback from the communities themselves so that the “impact” of the research can be articulated by those who are to benefit from it. Clearly, what is going to change is the traditional measurement stick of publication numbers. Because such research takes time, the publication rate is far slower. If the results of community-based research are not regarded, and measured, in different terms, it will begin to have a detrimental effect on researchers’ professional advancement and will act as a disincentive for many potential researchers to pursuing that form of scholarly activity.

Clearly, on a wider scale, SSHRC’s Transformation goal of achieving a “full research cycle” will be similarly compromised in the absence of a shift in the merit culture at Canadian universities. Universities will need to be assisted by SSHRC to recognize the value of non-traditional modes of research dissemination. The University of Saskatchewan’s Vice-President Research, and the Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of Council, can play a role here by regarding this as consistent with their stated aim of removing “obstacles hindering full participation in the research agenda” (Foundational Document: “Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work”: 2).

3.2.1 Community-Based Health Research: The University has prioritized health research and teaching, and sees its goal as bringing health-related “teaching and research programs together in a more focussed and collaborative way aimed principally at addressing pressing issues of importance to the people of Saskatchewan and to the country at large” (“U of S Integrated Plan,” April 9 draft: 5). It can become well positioned to build on its strong record of interdisciplinary community health research that already exists through its CURA, CUISR, RESOLVE, SPHERU and Institute of Agricultural, Rural and Environmental Health projects, and through related work being done in many Arts and Science, Kinesiology and Medicine departments. As a respondent from the College of Medicine put it, “although SSHRC researchers may think they are ‘behind’ in their funding or future vision, they are in a most enviable position as governments, policy players, health care workers, and laypeople in general are absolutely desperate to have a body of researchers make some sense of all the research data that scientists have found (i.e. what meaning do these findings have and what impact will they have on quality of life?).”

3.2.2: Interdisciplinary Confederations and Institutes: SSHRC’s proposed “Confederations of Learning” (“20 to 30 researchers interacting regularly under the guidance of a director, supporting people’s systematic and recurrent interactions involving “complex problems [such as] the determinants of health”) would assist researchers here in focussing on complex health-related problems by collecting them within a group not defined along discipline-specific lines. Similarly, SSHRC’s proposal for more formal institutes “created by SSHRC’s Board for a certain period ... to focus on cross-cutting issues of major and immediate importance” could, for example, collect researchers at Innovation Place, related University departments and units, and Agriculture Canada involved in the various scientific and social aspects of genetic crop research. Much work in this area is done at the University of Saskatchewan but it frequently remains isolated along discipline-specific lines and lacks a mechanism for being communicated to a public that is eager for the results of such investigation. These Transformation proposals were generally regarded at this University as presenting potentially useful ways for fostering the interdisciplinary and public out-reach goals of the University that its present configuration of programming and discipline-specific structures tends to prevent (and that its latest “Integrated Planning Document” confronts).

Three cautionary notes to this, however, were sounded by respondents. One was that “we worry about the plan for confederations of learning leading to the funding of closed (non-public) conferences so that in-groups of scholars might meet at public expense.” Another addressed the relative difficulty for smaller institutions to generate Principal Investigators due to “higher teaching loads and other administrative responsibilities” and to the comparative scarcity of institutional time-release and start-up funds. The result can be that the larger institutions have the greater likelihood of successfully producing Principal Investigators, which has not only intellectual repercussions for a University such as this one, but funding mechanism implications as well: Tri-Council funding formulas privilege Principal Investigators on large-scale projects. A third caution was put this way: “the move to interdisciplinary research groups is a positive move in the direction of research intensity across Canada. [However,] if these Confederations of Learning become research groups themselves (that is, produce research themselves), this will compromise the viability and productivity of the groups currently existing and being formed at the individual universities. In other words, everything does not have to be initiated out of a central funding agency. The goal should be to unleash something that is already becoming a strength on its own. The same holds for the proposed Formal Institutes.”

3.3 Connecting SSHRC’s Transformation Proposals with Specific Research Needs at the University of Saskatchewan

The formulas used to determine the funding this University receives for the Canada Research Chairs program (CRC), the Saskatchewan Universities Funding Mechanism (SUFM), the Indirect Costs of Research program and the SSHRC Institutional Grants program (SIG) are directly tied to the University’s Tri-Council success rates. This University’s SSHRC success rate is below the national average and, as a consequence, research funding at this University has suffered. Part of the responsibility

for improvement in this area lies with the University's capacity to respond to the challenge of increasing its Tri-Council success rates. However, part of the problem is caused by the way SSHRC granting programs determine the funding this and other institutions receive.

3.3.1: SSHRC Institutional Grants: For example, one way this University attempts to increase its SSHRC success rate is to connect its SSHRC Institutional Grants (the "President's SSHRC Fund" grants) to future SSHRC Standard Research Grant (or other external grant) applications. The President's SSHRC Fund grants are regarded as a means of strengthening recipients' CVs to position them for successful grant applications, and future application for them is a condition of the President's SSHRC Fund award. However, the formula to determine the SIG funding to this University is itself determined by our previous SSHRC success on a three-year rolling cycle. When the SSHRC President's Fund grants are spread even thinner by awarding some of them to applicants in our disproportionately large 4A category, the problem becomes even more acute.

Because the SIG program is a necessary element in strategies for increasing SSHRC success rates here, the formula for determining it must change. As SSHRC's statistics show, universities outside Ontario and Quebec have a lower percentage of recommended applications funded; the same is true of medium-sized universities (*From Granting Council to Knowledge Council 2*: 13). One way to address this is to connect SIGs directly to the number of SSHRC-eligible researchers at the institution, not to a rolling three-year formula. If, however, this has the negative effect of privileging larger institutions that do not rely on the SIG program as heavily, then this proposal should be implemented selectively for regional and medium- to small-size universities. This will help ensure that the SIG program becomes a truly useful incentive for the researchers and institutions that need it.

3.3.2: Current Funding Formula for Doctoral Fellowships: This paradox also distorts the system used to determine the number of SSHRC Doctoral Fellowships received here. (As several graduate students, upon recognizing this, commented, "why would we want to do our graduate degrees here instead of at UBC or U of A where our chances of success are so much better?") One suggested solution to this problem was to connect the amount of funding directly to the number of eligible graduate students here, and to provide a grant to the institution that it would decide how to allocate.

The Transformation proposal that SSHRC play a role in matching graduate students with academically relevant "quality learning environments" at institutions was not well received. Among other questions it raised was how such decisions would be made and how the merit of institutions and programs would be measured ("How could SSHRC begin to assess what a 'quality-learning environment' is?" asked one respondent.) There was concern that such a system might, in the long run, merely assist the rich-become-richer dynamic that the current funding mechanisms already encourage among institutions. As one group of respondents put it, "surely the 'best and the brightest' should be left to decide where they want to pursue their graduate studies."

3.3.3: Other Proposals for Transforming Graduate Student Funding: Aside from the paradox inherent in the funding formula for Doctoral Fellowships, other issues involving graduate funding were raised. There was a general sense that graduate fellowships should remain distinct awards, and not become tied exclusively to faculty grant-holders' projects and budgets. As one group of respondents put it, "we would rather see graduate students funded from scholarships than through research grants.... This idea might be workable in densely populated areas like southern Ontario ... however, the mobility of many graduate students is limited, and on the prairies, distances between graduate schools are considerable." Respondents also felt that an additional advantage to the individual doctoral awards is that they encourage the growth of independent thinking crucial in the Social Sciences and Humanities.

Training grants for graduate students, involving placing them within collaborative teams (along CIHR lines), also met with scepticism and concern. A student's degree cycle does not always coincide with the project's research cycle; thus, a student might leave in the early stages of a project and not participate in publishing, or enter near the end of a project and not participate in meaningful research.

Graduate training is in many ways a form of apprenticeship. However, SSHRC-funded graduate students do not teach, whereas those without such funding often must. Ironically, therefore, the apprenticeship of the SSHRC-funded student is reduced in scope.

3.4 Responses to other Aspects of the SSHRC Transformation Proposals:

3.4.1: “The Human Sciences”: There was a general reaction among Humanities faculty and graduate student respondents here that the SSHRC Transformation proposals reflect “a strong bias in favour of the Social Sciences in terms of language, models of research practices, and emphasis on policy-relevant research.” The term “human sciences” was regarded with scepticism by some (though not all) respondents, and the spectre of larger and more collaborative project-based funding was seen as, in many cases, incommensurate with the solitary-scholar engine that drives much Humanities research.

3.4.2: The Importance of the Standard Research Grant Program: In keeping with this, there was an unequivocal endorsement of the Standard Research Grant (SRG) program, and of the option to provide smaller grants to more scholars (as opposed to larger grants to fewer). One respondent argued for the smaller-grants option this way: “This would increase the overall research output and thus also help raise the public level of awareness—the more scholars actively pursuing more research, the more ‘product’ will be transferred to both students and the general public.” Similarly, there was a clear preference for the support of curiosity-driven research over targeted research conducted for more utilitarian purposes. As one respondent put it, “my experience of participating in several targeted research programs is that there is a core group of researchers who benefit enormously from the research dividends and then there is a group of researchers on the periphery who have usually been asked to participate at the last minute, are not part of the conceptual project, and therefore do not play much of role in the research. So the goal of including more researchers in targeted research programs may be illusory.”

At the same time, many respondents expressed frustration over several aspects of the present SRG program. One was the complexity of the application process and of the form itself. Another was the emphasis placed on the applicant’s track record: many faculty anticipate that their record will not be judged to be meritorious for an award, and therefore do not apply. (This observation recalls the importance at this institution of the SIG as a means of improving a CV for the purpose of a future SRG application.)

Many also observed that SSHRC tends to award grants to project proposals that can predict with some certainty the results they will yield; while this in itself is not inappropriate in some cases, it tends to entrench a conservatism in the projects that are awarded. It is much easier to clearly anticipate the results of a project proposal that builds incrementally upon a previous track record (the researcher has done “x” in the past and now proposes to do “x+1”). However, many project proposals that “take a chance” remain unfunded because they do not build upon a previous record in this way. (As one respondent put it, he would like SSHRC to recall the adage “don’t be afraid to go out on a limb – that’s where the fruit is.”)

Finally, respondents questioned the \$7,000 minimum stipulated in the SRG budget and believed they would benefit from a smaller SRG award than is currently offered.

3.4.3: Role of CFHSS: The Congress of the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences was frequently invoked as an available and necessary means of accomplishing some of SSHRC’s new goals regarding the communication of research among scholars, the media and the public. One suggestion for increasing interdisciplinary cross-over of Humanities research involved making Society sessions at the Congress accessible to larger audiences. “If each Society provided detailed conference schedules to the Congress’ Organisers to be entered into a data-base before the start of Congress, interested individuals would be able to utilize that data-base using keyword and name searches. This would not only raise the impact of the Congress and allow more opportunity to develop interdisciplinary debates, it might also encourage Societies to retain their memberships and participation in the Congress.”

3.4.4: Release Time Stipends: Researchers in many disciplines, particularly in the Humanities and Fine Arts, commented that release-time was their primary requirement in order to conduct their research. At the same time, concern was expressed by respondents in many disciplines that the University's Teacher-Scholar model could be compromised by moving researchers out of the classroom with Release Time Stipends, "reinforcing the notion that teaching is secondary to work done outside the classroom by academics" and threatening to produce a two-tier university culture that divides researchers and teachers.

3.4.5: The New Research/ Creation Grants: There was mixed reaction on the part of Fine Arts faculty to the new Research/Creation Grants. Although the initiative to include Fine Arts faculty and graduate students into the SSHRC granting programs is a necessary one, the language of the application was seen as "off-putting," and more appropriate for Social Sciences or Humanities grants. The emphasis on working collaboratively and within teams was felt to be an impediment, as was the complexity of the application form itself. Taken together, these factors led some to ask why they would choose to apply to SSHRC instead of the Canada Council or the Saskatchewan Arts Board, agencies that understand the needs of Fine Arts faculty more clearly. SSHRC's request that applicants show how their work will be disseminated through a broad public was thought to be redundant here – as one group of respondents put it, "we already participate with public and non-university venues and audiences" and "we're already 'transformed' because we're already in the public sphere." On the whole, it was felt that these grants are absolutely essential and a laudable initiative on SSHRC's part; now, they need to be re-visited and altered to address the specific requirements and types of work done by Fine Arts faculty and graduate students here and at other institutions.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1: The twin pillars of SSHRC's proposed Transformation – greater collaborative and interdisciplinary research, and greater public impact – are consistent with the University of Saskatchewan's research aspirations and, to a certain extent, accomplishments. It is of vital importance that this University be able to look to SSHRC for leadership in continuing to develop and legitimate the institution's and the Council's complementary goals.

4.2: The recent pilot program for Aboriginal Research is an important component of SSHRC's future support for researchers here. SSHRC must play a role in creating a similar recognition of the importance of Aboriginal research at other colleges and universities by seeking the assistance of successful participants in its pilot project, by enhancing its Aboriginal academic presence and capacity, and by continuing its commitment to the kinds of exchange that led to this new initiative.

4.3: Working with Aboriginal communities requires establishing their trust. This demands a longer time for the research work to develop. It is imperative that communities be included as equal partners in each stage of the process and that principles of sound research not be compromised.

4.4: A regional Request for Application should be created that is indexed to Aboriginal research only and that addresses the priority research issues that communities would like to see addressed.

4.5: Aboriginal individuals residing in communities could be engaged as Community coordinators for, or liaisons between, their communities and university researchers.

4.6: A portion of research grant funds should reside in the community rather than exclusively at the research institution.

4.7: A mechanism for providing a consistent funding stream for community-based research is needed. The perception of community-based research by partners and communities outside the university will suffer if funding exists on a one-time basis, and SSHRC's Transformation goal of greater public impact will, in this context, not be realized.

4.8: Mechanisms for evaluating and measuring the value of projects will become increasingly necessary. One way would be to recognize the extent to which the research project has attracted funding from other agencies, governments or related organizations. Another would involve developing a mechanism for feedback from the communities themselves so that the "impact" of the research can be articulated by those who are to benefit from it.

4.9: SSHRC will need to assist universities to recognize the value of non-traditional modes of research dissemination. The University of Saskatchewan's Vice-President Research, and the Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of Council, can play a role here.

4.10: The University should take advantage of SSHRC's proposed emphasis on Interdisciplinary Confederations and Institutes because it complements the University's own interdisciplinary community health research that exists through its CURA, CUISR, RESOLVE, SPHERU and I.ARE.H projects, and through related work being done in many Arts and Science, Kinesiology and Medicine departments.

4.11: SSHRC must address the current tendency of large collaborative program mechanisms to favour non-regional, small- to medium-size institutions.

4.12: SSHRC must change the formula for determining SIG funding to ensure that it becomes a truly useful incentive for the researchers and small- to medium size regional institutions that need it. This can be achieved by connecting SIGs directly to the number of SSHRC-eligible researchers at the institution, not to a rolling three-year formula.

4.13: SSHRC must change the formula for determining the number of Doctoral Fellowships a small- to medium size regional institution can receive. One way to achieve this is to connect the amount of funding directly to the number of eligible graduate students at the institution, and to provide a grant to the institution that it would decide how to allocate.

4.14: SSHRC should avoid playing a role in matching graduate students with academically relevant “quality learning environments.”

4.15: Graduate fellowships should remain distinct awards, and not become tied exclusively to faculty grant-holders’ projects and budgets.

4.16: SSHRC should avoid training grants for graduate students that involve placing them within collaborative teams (along CIHR lines).

4.17: Humanities faculty and graduate students felt that the SSHRC Transformation proposals are biased in favour of the Social Sciences in terms of language, models of research practices, and emphasis on policy-relevant research.

4.18: SSHRC’s SRG program must be maintained as a program and funding priority. The option of providing smaller grants to more scholars (as opposed to larger grants to fewer) was strongly endorsed.

4.19: The present SRG application process is too complex, too much emphasis is placed on the applicant’s track-record, and the minimum budget of \$7,000 is too high.

4.20: The Congress of the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences is a valuable and available means of accomplishing some of SSHRC’s new goals regarding the communication of research among scholars, the media and the public.

4.21: Release-time stipends are an indispensable component of SSHRC grants. However, they threaten to produce a two-tier university culture that divides researchers and teachers.

4.22: The new Research/Creation grants are an essential and laudable initiative. They now need to be re-visited and altered to address the specific requirements and types of work done by Fine Arts faculty and graduate students here and at other institutions.

Appendix A: Consultations List

Consultations occurred with Peter Stoicheff (SSHRC Transformation Representative at the University of Saskatchewan) and the following University of Saskatchewan administrators, committees, colleges, community partners, faculty groups and SSHRC administrators and colleagues:

SSHRC Transformation Representatives (Toronto, January 30-31)

Vice-President Research Steven Franklin (February 5)

Provost and VP Academic Michael Atkinson (February 11)

Associate Deans of Research Committee (February 26)

Budget Committee of Council (February 27)

Planning Committee of Council (March 1)

Faculty Association Chair Bob Gander (March 2)

Dean's Committee of Council (March 2)

President's SSHRC Committee (March 3)

College of Arts & Science Dean, Associate Deans, and Heads of
Social Sciences, Humanities and Fine Arts departments (March 3)

Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of Council (March 4)

Humanities and Fine Arts Divisional Planning Committee (March 4)

Dean of Graduate Studies and Research Tom Wishart,
and Departmental Research Chairs Committee (March 5)

SSHRC President Marc Renaud and Vice-President (Knowledge Products and Mobilization),
community-related researchers and research partners, faculty involved in Aboriginal research,
Aboriginal research partners, faculty and graduate students in Humanities and Fine Arts
disciplines, library administration and staff, faculty and graduate students in Social Sciences
disciplines (across all related colleges) and the *Saskatoon StarPhoenix* editorial board
(March 11)

St. Thomas More faculty and administration (March 19)

Chief Glen Johnstone, Chief of the Saskatoon Tribal Council, and Roger Maaka, Head of Native
Studies (March 24)

Dean of Graduate Studies and Research Tom Wishart, graduate chairs and graduate students (April 7)

Acting Chair and Faculty, Department of Art and Art History (April 26)