2023 Innovation Fund
Expert Committee meeting
Mandate

To increase the capability of Canada’s universities, colleges, research hospitals and non-profit research organizations to carry out high quality research by investing in research infrastructure.
Funding model

CFI provides 40% of infrastructure costs (remaining 60% provided by provinces, institutions and private sector)

O&M support

30% of CFI award through the Infrastructure Operating Fund (IOF)
Competition budget & objectives

OBJECTIVES

• Enable internationally competitive research or technology development through the equitable participation of expert team member

• Enhance and optimize the capacity of institutions and research communities to conduct the proposed research or technology development program(s) over the useful life of the infrastructure

• Lead to social, health, environmental and/or economic benefits for Canadians

$400 million Capital + $120 million Infrastructure Operating Fund
Role of the expert committee
### Competition objectives

1. Enable internationally competitive research or technology development through the equitable participation of expert team members.
2. Enhance and optimize the capacity of institutions and research communities to conduct the proposed research or technology development program(s) over the useful life of the infrastructure.
3. Lead to social, health, environmental and/or economic benefits for Canadians.

### Assessment criteria

- Research or technology development
- Team expertise
- Team composition
- Infrastructure
- Sustainability
- Benefits
**EX**
SIGNIFICANTLY EXCEEDS
The proposal satisfies and significantly exceeds the criterion standard

**SA**
SATISFACTORY
The proposal satisfies the criterion standard

**SW**
SATISFACTORY WITH WEAKNESSES
The proposal satisfies the criterion standard, but has a few minor weaknesses

**PS**
PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY
The proposal partially satisfies the criterion standard and has some significant weaknesses

**NS**
NOT SATISFACTORY
The proposal does not satisfy the criterion standard due to major weaknesses
Commitment to Equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) principles

Why is EDI integrated into the 2023 IF competition?
• Recognition that diversity (e.g., gender, career stage, culture) is critical to excellence in research
• Belief that an equitable, diverse and inclusive culture is the responsibility of every member of the research ecosystem, including funders, institutions, researchers, experts and reviewers

How is EDI integrated into the 2023 IF competition?
• Strongly encourage committee members to complete Bias in Peer Review Training module
• Introduced (new) assessment criterion on ‘Team composition’
• Assessment of criterion must be satisfactory for proposal to be considered for funding
Research or technology development

The research or technology development program(s) are innovative, feasible and internationally competitive.
Team expertise

The team comprises the breadth of experience and expertise needed to conduct the proposed research program(s).
Team composition

Principles of equity and diversity were considered in the team composition including in its leadership. There is a commitment to create an inclusive environment where all team members are fully integrated and supported in the research team.
Team composition criterion

Criterion standard: Principles of equity and diversity were considered in the team composition including in its leadership. There is a commitment to create an inclusive environment where all team members are fully integrated and supported in the research team.

To satisfy this criterion applicants should:

1. Identify specific challenges/barriers to underrepresented groups in their research program;
2. Describe concrete practice(s) put in place to overcome challenges/barriers and to demonstrate equity and diversity were intentionally considered in the research team’s composition; and
3. Describe concrete practice(s) to be adopted to increase inclusion of underrepresented groups in their research program.

1 See pg. 13-14 of Guidelines for Expert Committees for further details
Assessment of Team composition criterion (part 1)

To fully satisfy the criterion standard: demonstrate EDI awareness and **intentionality** and substantiate responses using **concrete examples** of **direct relevance** to the research team and proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion aspects</th>
<th>Satisfies the criterion (EX/SA/SW)</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Analysis of specific challenges or systemic barriers | • Specific challenges/barriers clearly identified  
• Examples or data provided | • Women/visible minorities underrepresented in team’s department or field  
• % of faculty or HQP from underrepresented groups  
• Barriers include bias in hiring practices, limited distribution of job opportunities |
| Concrete practice to overcome systemic barriers | • Concrete practice(s) to address challenges/barriers taken by team  
• Practice(s) pertain to challenges/barriers identified above | • Team members actively sought to increase representation of women/visible minorities  
• Hiring panels took EDI training  
• Outreach to potential team members or HQP included inclusive language and broad promotion of opportunities |
| Concrete practices to ensure inclusion | • Specific practice(s) to enable inclusion identified  
• Implementation of practice(s) clearly outlined | • Team leaders will foster a safe and respectful work environment  
• A confidential process for placing, and addressing, complaints will be developed  
• An annual culture survey will be sent to all team members |
Proposals do not meet the criterion standard if: provide primarily generic statements/information, fail to include specific examples and concrete practices, and lack evidence/substantiation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion aspects</th>
<th>Fails to meet the criterion (PS/NS)</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of specific challenges or systemic barriers</td>
<td>• Only generic/high level challenges identified                                                   • There are fewer women in science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No examples or data provided                                                                    • Little/no data provided on proportion of women in research field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- • No recognition of gender and/or intersectionality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- • Counts (# or %) of women/visible minorities in the team instead of discussion of challenges and barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete practice to overcome systemic barriers</td>
<td>• Only generic or institutional practice(s) to address challenges/barrier identified              • Refer only to institutional/faculty level actions such as EDI/anti-racism policies or signing Dimensions Charter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No evidence of practices implemented by team                                                   • Little/no evidence that any team members are engaged in EDI activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete practice to ensure inclusion</td>
<td>• Only generic or institutional practice(s) to enable inclusion                                   • Refer only to institutional/faculty level actions, policies or practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lacks implementation plan for enabling inclusion within research team                          • Lacks understanding what inclusion is meant to achieve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- • Plan to assess team culture or diversity not addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Infrastructure

The requested infrastructure is necessary and appropriate to conduct the proposed research program(s) and optimally enhances existing capacity.
Sustainability

The infrastructure will be optimally used, operated and sustained over its useful life through tangible commitments.
Benefits

The team and its partners have a well-defined plan to transfer the results of the research or technology development program(s). The results are likely to lead to social, economic, health or environmental benefits for Canadians.
Conflicts of interest

• Relative, close friend, or have a personal relationship
• In a position to gain or lose financially or materially from the funding of the proposal
• Long-standing scientific or personal differences
• Currently affiliated with the candidates’ institutions, organizations or companies
• Close professional affiliation - in the last six years:
  • frequent and regular interactions
  • supervisor or a trainee
  • collaborated, published or shared funding
  • been employed by the applicant institution
• feel for any reason unable to provide an impartial review of the proposal.

Confidentiality

Review committee members, external reviewers and observers must ensure that:

• Maintain all documentation and information in strict confidence at all times
• Only use the documentation and information for the purpose for review of proposals
• Destroy the review documentation in a secure manner when it is no longer required
• Do not contact the candidates for additional information or disclose matters arising from the review process to the candidates
• Review deliberations are confidential
West & Territories (77) $287M

Ontario (114) $478M

Québec (92) $338M

Atlantic (14) $36M

297 Proposals

$1.1B CFI request

$3.1B Total project costs

63 Institutions

57 3+ collaborators
Expert committee report

CONSENSUS REPORTS

• Includes:
  • consensus assessment of each criterion
  • comments on the strengths and weaknesses
  • assessment of the budget

• Drafted by CFI staff, finalized in consultation with the Chair

• Provided to the MACs to guide their discussions

• Provided to applicant institution at the end of the review process
How to enter ratings and comments in CAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team - expertise</td>
<td>Please select...</td>
<td>View/edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team - composition</td>
<td>Please select...</td>
<td>View/edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Significantly exceeds the criterion standard (EX)</td>
<td>View/edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfies the criterion standard (SA)</td>
<td>View/edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially satisfies the criterion standard with some significant weaknesses (PS)</td>
<td>View/edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not satisfy the criterion standard due to major weaknesses (NS)</td>
<td>View/edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Please select...</td>
<td>View/edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Please select...</td>
<td>View/edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research or technology development</td>
<td>Please select...</td>
<td>View/edit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Member’s to-do list

1. Activate your CAMS account

2. Complete the unconscious bias training module

3. Read the proposals

4. Read proposal package:
   - Guidelines for expert committee members
   - Preliminary review template (word) if online entry is not feasible
   - Meeting agenda
   - Quick reference guide

5. Conduct preliminary assessment of proposals
   - Enter ratings and comments in CAMS one week before the meeting
Secure document sharing directory

1. Link
2. Consent
3. Download
4. Upload
Consent

- Conflict of interest
- Disclosure and compliance measures
- Confidentiality
### Shared documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share name</th>
<th>FRQ Document 1</th>
<th>FRQ Document 2</th>
<th>Recipient's document</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaging_F12023_FRQS</td>
<td>(Proposals and report template.zip 27549 Ko)</td>
<td>(Reference documents.zip 3246 Ko)</td>
<td>Add a new document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Download and report writing.

Upload: One folder zipped with all documents.
Questions?

THANK YOU!