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1 Description of Funding Instrument
The Community Engagement Funding Instrument is a competitive funding instrument, which provides the space for research that contributes both to knowledge production within the ambit of community engagement (here community is defined in its broadest sense); as well as research on the processes and dynamics of engagement from the perspective of the higher education sector. This funding instrument is aimed at supporting and providing the enabling conditions for higher education institutions to come to grips with some of the philosophical and conceptual challenges associated with the dynamics of community engagement and social responsiveness, as a field of research enquiry.

Key features of the instrument:
- Research which contributes to deeper theoretical, philosophical and conceptual orientations of community engagement from a higher education perspective;
- Research which interrogates the complex interplay and processes of engagement; that is, the various ways in which knowledge is produced, assimilated and utilized through interactions and relationships with communities;

Case studies, typologies, appreciative inquiry about community engagement and community assessments.

Key assumptions underpinning the programme:
- The conception, definition or meaning ascribed to the notion of “community” is not universal or pre-determined in the programme; it may be the focus of the project; and will depend on how each project defines it.
- An exploration of community engagement implies that communities (however defined) have roles and agency in a reciprocal set of relations.

This Research in Community Engagement instrument is not aimed at:
- Community Development;
- Community Service;
- Community Outreach

2 STRATEGIC CONTEXT

2.1 Policy Perspective
Along with teaching and learning, and research, community engagement is cast as one of the pillars of the South African Higher Education system. The transformative White Paper on Higher Education (1997) has called upon universities to “demonstrate social responsibility and their commitment to the common good by making available expertise and infrastructure for community service programmes”. A key objective is to “promote and develop social responsibility and awareness amongst students of the role of higher education in social and economic development through community engagement” contribute towards the. Community Engagement Funding Instrument is also aligned to the Department of Science and Technology (DST)’s Human and Social Dynamics Grand Challenge. This Grand Challenge is intended to address an array of social, economic, political, scientific and technological benefits.
2.2 Role of the National Research Foundation (NRF)

The mandate of the NRF is to support and promote research through funding, human resource development and the provision of the necessary research facilities so as to facilitate the creation of knowledge, innovation and development in all fields of science and technology, including indigenous knowledge and thereby to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life of all the people of the Republic (NRF Act, 1998).

In support of its purpose, the NRF recently launched the NRF Strategy 2020 that aims at contributing to the development of, a vibrant and globally connected national system of innovation, and anchored by five Strategic Outcomes, namely:

- An internationally competitive, transformed and representative research system;
- Leading-edge research and infrastructure platforms;
- A reputable and influential agency shaping the science and technology system;
- Scientifically literate and engaged society; and
- A skilled, committed and representative NRF and technical workforce

Community Engagement Funding Instrument’s research and activities at the NRF are aimed at improving our understanding of the full spectrum of community engagement and the suite of activities that this implies. This may include, *inter alia*:

- negotiating the terrain of knowledge production as a site of multiple processes and relations,
- interrogating the ways in which tacit knowledge is surfaced in the complex process of community engagement; and assessing the impact for, and
- changes in communities as a result of newly coded knowledge.

2.3 Objectives

The objectives of the funding instrument are:

- To sharpen and mainstream the higher education sector’s response to community engagement as a third pillar of academic activity (Hall: 2009).
- To facilitate the development of robust theoretical and conceptual positions on community engagement in the South African context; and thereby stimulate and contribute to contemporary debates on the issue.
- To create new forms of knowledge in this area.
- To develop human capacity in the area of community engagement.

2.4 Financing support

The Community Engagement funding instrument is funded through the NRF’s Parliamentary Core Funding. As a demand driven funding instrument, there is no limit to the amount an applicant can request. However, the financial requests need to be in line with requirements and accurately reflect the financial needs of the proposed work. Excessive budget requests are not well received by the review panels. Applications will be scored according to a
scorecard (see Annexure 1), and the Final number of applications to be funded will be determined by the available budget as well as the strategic imperatives of the NRF.

2.5 Key stakeholders
The key stakeholders involved in the Community Engagement Funding Instrument are persons based at public research institutions that are recognised by directive of the Minister of Science and Technology. These include mainly, Public Universities, Museums, National Research Facilities, Science Councils and other NRF Recognised Research Institutions.

2.6 Information sources


The Department of Science and Technology, 2013. The ministerial guidelines for improving equity in the distribution of DST/NRF bursaries and fellowships.

3 MODUS OPERANDI

3.1 Call for proposals
All application materials must be submitted electronically via the NRF Online Submission System at https://nrfsubmission.nrf.ac.za

All applications must be endorsed by the research office or equivalent of the institution of the principal applicant before submission to the NRF. It is the responsibility of each applicant to familiarise himself/herself with the internal closing dates, set by their institution in order to meet the NRF closing date.

Incomplete OR late submissions will not be accepted.

Call opens: 26 April 2018
Call closes: 28 May 2018
3.2 Eligibility

- Each Principal Investigator (PI) may only submit ONE application to this call. However, a researcher may participate either as a co-investigator or collaborator in more than one project;

- Full time employees at an NRF recognized research institution in South Africa;

- Part-time employees on contract at NRF recognized research institutions (as defined above) may apply, on condition that their appointment at the South African institution is for (at least) the duration of the project applied for in the submission. The length of the contract should be stated in the application form. The primary employment of the individual concerned must be at that institution. A contract researcher appointed at a research institution on behalf of a third party to fulfill a very specific function for the latter does not qualify for support.

- Retired unrated academics/researchers, provided that they meet all set criteria as stipulated below:
  - are resident in South Africa (SA);
  - are formally affiliated to a South African Higher Education Institution (e.g., appointed as an emeritus professor, honorary research associate/professor, supernumerary/contract employee);
  - are active researchers with a distinguished track record in research and postgraduate student supervision;
  - are actively mentoring/training postgraduate students/young research staff and
  - the institution ensures that a minimum of reasonable time (6 months minimum) is spent at the facility for the purpose of research and research capacity development.

3.3 Application assessment

The assessment of applications will be guided by a Panel Assessment Scorecard (see Annexure 1), and scored according to the Proposal Grading (see Annexure 2). Application assessment will occur by way of a two-tiered process:

- Postal/remote peer review
  The remote peer reviewers will be specialists in the ambit of the respective proposals. Requests for written reviews will be solicited electronically, or through appropriate media / means from peers located at remote locations from the NRF. Applicants will be requested to provide between 6 to 10 possible reviewers. It is in the applicant’s best interest to ensure that the selected reviewers are aware of the submission and are thus likely to respond. It is also in the applicant’s best interest to ensure that selected reviewers have no possible conflict of interest in submitting a review; as such review reports are dismissed without consideration. On average, a 30% response rate is achieved by the NRF in requesting postal peer reviews.
• **Panel-peer review**
  The adjudication panel will be broadly constituted to include senior academics, selected based both on their knowledge of Community Engagement research and their research standing. The panel meeting will be held at central location. Panel members will deliberate on submitted written reviews and will be expected to offer their own expert opinions.

  **NB:** Applicants must ensure that their Curriculum Vitae are updated on the NRF Online Submission System at [https://nrfsubmission.nrf.ac.za](https://nrfsubmission.nrf.ac.za).

  These Curriculum Vitae are used in the assessment processes, and incomplete or outdated inputs will jeopardise the application.

### 3.4 Rules of participation

**a) Principal Investigator**

Only researchers based at NRF recognized research institutions in South Africa (as defined above) are eligible to apply as principal investigators in this funding instrument.

The principal investigator (i.e. the applicant) must be an active researcher or community engagement practitioner who takes intellectual responsibility for the project, its conception, any strategic decisions called for in its pursuit, and the communication of results. The principal investigator must have the capacity to make a serious commitment to the project and cannot assume the role of a supplier of resources for work that will largely be placed in the hands of others. The PI will take responsibility for the management and administration of resources allocated to the grant award, and for the meeting of reporting requirements.

- A principal investigator should not submit a funding proposal on behalf of a student where the student in the main will be carrying out the research.

**The research team may also include:**

- **Co-investigators**
  A co-investigator is an active researcher who provides significant commitment, intellectual input and relevant expertise into the design and implementation of the research application. S/he will be involved in all or at least some well-defined research activities within the scope of the application. South African-based co-investigators are eligible to receive NRF funds from the grant if the team’s application is successful.

  **Post-doctoral fellows, students, technical and support staff should NOT be listed as co-investigators**
The project may also include:

- **Research Associates / Collaborators**
  These are individuals or groups who are anticipated to make a relatively small, but meaningful contribution to the research endeavours outlined in the application, but who have not actively participated in the research design. They are not considered a part of the core research team, and are not eligible to receive NRF funds from the grant if the team’s application is successful.

### 3.5 Data management and use

A data management plan (DMP) is a formal document that describes the data you expect to acquire or generate during the course of a research project, how you will manage, describe, analyze, and store those data, and what mechanisms (including digital data storage) you will use at the end of your project to share and preserve your data.

Research data sharing that underlies the findings reported in a journal article/ conference paper/thesis as set out in the NRF Open Access Statement. The findings reported in a journal article or conference paper should be deposited in accordance with the NRF Open Access Statement. It is acknowledged that some data generated are more sensitive than others. Before initiating the research, it is the grant holders’ responsibility to consider the following: confidentiality, ethics, security and copyright. Possible data sharing challenges should be considered in the DMP with solutions to optimise data sharing.

Researchers should note that publicly funded research data should be in the public domain, with free and open access, by default. Collaborators and co-investigators in the research project should be informed by the applicant that due to public funding and funder mandate, one is expected to share research data as openly as possible. The Data Management Plan should indicate which data will be shared. If (some) research data is to be restricted, an appropriate statement in the DMP and subsequent publication should explain why access to data is restricted. The National Research Foundation has adopted and is given permission to use the Digital Curator Centre (DCC) checklist for Data Management Plan, and this can be used as a guide for developing the DMP. ([http://www.dcc.ac.uk/sites/default/files/documents/resource/DMP/DMP_Checklist_2013.pdf](http://www.dcc.ac.uk/sites/default/files/documents/resource/DMP/DMP_Checklist_2013.pdf))

### 3.6 Science Engagement

The NRF supports science engagement through its coordination and implementation of the Department of Science and Technology’s Science Engagement Strategy. The strategy embraces a broad understanding of science, encompassing systematic knowledge spanning natural and physical sciences, engineering sciences, medical sciences, agricultural sciences, mathematics, social sciences and humanities, technology, all aspects of the innovation chain and indigenous knowledge. Within this context, science engagement refers to activities, events, or interactions characterised by mutual learning and dialogue among people of varied backgrounds, scientific expertise and life experiences, who articulate and discuss their perspectives, ideas, knowledge and values. Science engagement is an overarching term for all aspects of public engagement with science, science awareness, science education, science...
communication and science outreach, which aim to develop and benefit individuals and society. Researchers funded through the NRF programmes are required to contribute to science engagement and report the related outputs in their project’s Annual Performance Reports.

3.7 Timelines
The Community Engagement research grants will be awarded for a period of no more than three years (2019 – 2021).

3.8 Management of funding instrument
The KAS Directorate of the NRF (RISA) manages the Community Engagement Funding Instrument and is primarily responsible for:

- Strategic oversight and management of the funding instrument;
- Conceptualizing and developing the funding instrument;
- Coordinating and facilitating activities of the funding instrument;
- Compiling funding instrument research and evaluation reports;
- Stakeholder engagement; and
- Ensuring that the funding instruments delivers on its intended goal(s).

The Reviews and Evaluation (RE) Directorate is responsible for managing the adjudication process including:

- sourcing of reviewers both for remote reviews and panels;
- managing the peer review process;
- organizing and managing the review panels as and where appropriate; and
- providing feedback as appropriate

The Grants Management and Systems Administration (GMSA) Directorate is responsible for

- Managing the call process, that is,
  - Posting the call;
  - Receiving and assessing applications eligibility;
- Coordinating and facilitating the granting processes
- Managing the granting including the administration of awards;
- Administering grant payments; and
- Ensuring compliance to conditions of grants

3.9 Lines of authority
The Community Engagement Director in the KAS Directorate manages the funding instrument. The Director responsible for this instrument reports to the Executive Director of the KAS Directorate. Directors from RE and GMSA manage the review and granting processes. The Directors in both RE and GMSA report to their respective Executive Directors.
4 FINANCIALS

4.1 Funding model
The grants of this funding instrument are to be primarily used for research purposes and development of associated human resources under the auspices of the NRF standard grant and finance policies. The money is released upon acceptance of the conditions of grant, both by the applicant and his/her employing institution. These grants will fall under the NRF audit requirements of beneficiary institutions.

4.2 Funding ranges
Successful applications will receive funding that accommodates the following budget items:

a) Grantholder-linked student support
b) Staff development grants
c) Research-related operating costs, including:
   o Sabbaticals
   o Materials and Supplies
   o Travel and subsistence
   o Research/Technical/Ad hoc Assistants
   o Research Equipment

The application assessment process will consider proposed budget items in terms of cost, risk and reward ratios. Decisions relating to budget items will also be governed by the overall funding instrument funds available for the period as well as NRF strategic imperatives. Awards will be made in line with the NRF funding rules and guidelines as outlined in Section 5.3.

4.3 Funding support
The NRF funds the Community Engagement Funding Instrument on an ongoing basis. Science councils, public universities, museums, national research facilities and other NRF-recognized institutions are the primary beneficiaries of this funding instrument. The NRF has systems in place to ensure that there is no double funding of projects that are already funded by the Medical Research Council and those funded by the National Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences.

GRANTHOLDER-LINKED STUDENT SUPPORT

Grantholder-linked student support will be awarded in accordance with eligibility criteria as detailed in the Ministerial Guidelines for Improving Equity in the Distribution of DST/NRF Bursaries and Fellowships (January 2013). The distribution for these bursaries is targeted at the following ratios:
• Final year Undergraduate and Honours/BTech student assistantships: 100% SA citizens with a minimum ratio\(^1\) of 1:1 for Black\(^2\) and White participants;
• Masters bursaries: 90% to South Africans and 10% to candidates from other African countries;
• Doctoral bursaries: 80:15:5, SA: Other African: Rest of the World; and
• Postdoctoral bursaries: Open to all who undertake research in South Africa.

The equity distribution for these bursaries is targeted at the ratio:
  - 80% Black
  - 55% Female
  - 4% Disabled

The awarding of postdoctoral fellowships will not be guided by, but not governed by, equity targets.

The citizenship distribution for these bursaries is targeted at the ratio:
  - 87% South African (including permanent residents)
  - 5% Southern African Development Community (SADC)
  - 4% Rest of the African continent
  - 4% Non-African

Postdoctoral fellowships will not be governed by citizenship targets, and remain open to all who undertake research in South Africa.

**Values of Student Assistantships**

- Honours / BTech (Full-time) R60 000 pa

The maximum support period for Honours/BTech students is 1 year.

**Values of Bursaries & Fellowships**

- Masters degree (Full-time) R90 000 pa
- Doctoral degree (Full-time) R120 000 pa
- Postdoctoral (pro rata per month) R220 000 pa

The maximum support period for a Masters student is 2 years. The maximum support period for a Doctoral student is 3 years and the maximum support period for a Postdoctoral fellowship is 2 years.

---

\(^1\) With the emphasis on Black students

\(^2\) Inclusive of Africans, Indians and Coloureds
RESEARCH-RELATED OPERATING COSTS

These costs include: materials and supplies, travel (including conferences and subsistence), equipment, and research / technical / ad hoc assistance. Sabbaticals to other research organisations and institutions of higher learning may also be included within the context of the project proposals. These costs should be justified and commensurate with the planned outputs. The amount awarded within this framework can be used at the discretion of the applicant.

Sabbaticals
Sabbaticals will be considered for a period from two to six months. The maximum sabbatical amount requested should not exceed R 80,000 for six months. Funding for sabbaticals of less than six months will be reduced pro-rata. Only principal investigators and co-investigators are eligible to apply for sabbatical funding.

Travel and subsistence

- **International conference attendance:**
  Generally the NRF restricts this amount to R50,000 per application per year for a team proposal, i.e., for principal investigators and co-investigator only.

- **International visits:**
  These will be considered on a case by case basis. Such visits must be integral to the research plan and strong motivations should accompany these requests. Realistic funding allocations will be based on the requested activities. Realistic funding allocations will be based on the requested activities. Only outgoing visits will be considered depending on the availability of funding.

- **Local conference attendance:**
  Generally the NRF restricts expenditure against this item to R5,000 per person (all costs). Support for local conference attendance could be requested for all listed co-investigators and post-graduate students. The applicant should motivate for:
    - The value of attending more than one local conference per annum if so requested
    - The number of people that should be funded to attend local conferences.

- **Local travel:**
  The NRF does not stipulate any rate for mileage as this will depend on the research institutions’ rate, which varies per institution. Applicants are requested to provide details of this rate, as well as the estimated distance to be travelled within the given year. Local accommodation costs should not exceed a three-star rating establishment, per night per person.
Research / Technical / Ad hoc Assistants

- The NRF will not pay for any salaries in this funding instrument.
- Requests for research / technical / ad hoc assistance should be treated judiciously. Generally the NRF would encourage applicants to engage students to undertake the research rather than employing research consultants. This guideline however does not apply when specific and / or highly specialized research / technical expertise is required. This should be CLEARLY motivated for in the proposal.
- Administrative assistance does NOT qualify as technical assistance.

Community Engagement Programme Specific Guidelines

It is acknowledged that community engagement research may require specific types of funding to support research in certain settings or projects. Applicants are advised to provide a clear rationale and justification for this type of expenditure in relation to the proposal and work plan activities. It is incumbent on the applicant to provide commensurate line items in the budget request. Examples include *inter alia*: payment for translators in the field, providing transport to fieldworkers etc. In each case, a clear motivation should be provided, which links to the objectives of the proposal.

**STAFF DEVELOPMENT GRANTS**

Grant holders may apply for Staff Development grants for South African staff members, who are not grant holders in their own right, at their own or other institutions. These staff members must be registered for Masters or Doctoral degrees and be supervised by the grant-holder or a team member. They must be directly involved in the NRF approved project.

These grants can be used to contribute towards the operating costs for research undertaken at the supervisor's facility, as well as the cost of travel and accommodation to enable staff members to meet with (co) / supervisors. These grants are awarded to a maximum of R30 000, depending on the nature of the research and the proximity of the student in relation to the supervisor. **Grant holders themselves are not eligible for Staff Development Grants.**

The maximum period of support is three years.

**FUNDING TO CATER FOR DISABILITIES**

Additional funding support to cater for disability will only be allocated to people with disabilities as specified in the Code of Good Practice on Employment of People with Disabilities as in the Employment Equity Act No 55 of 1998.
EXCLUSIONS
Generally, the NRF does not provide financial support for:

- Basic office equipment including computers and consumables unless the computer is required for the research itself or the applicant/team member is based at a museum.
- Basic office stationery, photocopying costs, printing costs unless these items form part of the research tools or the applicant/team member is based at a museum.
- Journal publication costs, journal subscription costs, book costs unless the applicant/team member is based at a museum.
- Telephone, fax and internet costs unless the applicant/team member is based at a museum.

4.4 Funding instrument budget
The Community Engagement Funding Instrument is made possible through the NRF’s Parliamentary Core Funding.

4.5 Financial control and reporting
Upon receipt of the signed Conditions of Grant letter, the NRF will release the awarded amount for the year. Grantholders will then be required to comply with the standard NRF financial management procedures, including the submission of an Annual Progress Report. These are to be submitted before the end of March of the following year, and are a prerequisite for the release of the subsequent year’s funding. Failure to submit the Annual Progress Report will result in the cancellation of the grant award.

5 MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF THE FUNDING INSTRUMENT
The NRF is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the Community Engagement Funding Instrument.

5.1 Reporting
The funding instrument Director is responsible for reporting quarterly on the contribution of the Community Engagement Funding Instrument Directorate’s Key Performance Indicators. In addition, the funding instrument Director is responsible for reviewing and reporting on the progress of the funding instrument.

5.2 Timeframes for programme review
The Community Engagement Funding Instrument will be evaluated by an appropriate external reviewer as appointed by the NRF. RISA will determine and set timeframes for the review, when deemed appropriate, or in line with existing guidelines.
5.3 Broad terms of reference for the programme review
The broad terms of reference for the programme review of the Community Engagement Funding Instrument will be determined by RISA with preliminary input by the KAS Directorate, and in consultation with the Reviews and Evaluation Directorate.

5.4 Utilisation of programme review findings and recommendations
The results of the evaluation will be used in line with the purposes set in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation. Evaluation results will also be used for funding instrument improvement and development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Queries related to funding rules</th>
<th>Queries related to the application process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Zolani Dyosi</td>
<td>Ms Siviwe Mokone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director: Knowledge Advancement and Support</td>
<td>Liaison Officer: Grants Management and Systems Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel: 012 481 4131</td>
<td>Tel: 012 481 4301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:zolani@nrf.ac.za">zolani@nrf.ac.za</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:siviwe@nrf.ac.za">siviwe@nrf.ac.za</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIST OF ACRONYMS

DCC       Data Curator Centre
DMP       Data Management Plan
DST       Department of Science and Technology
GMSA      Grants Management and Systems Administration
KAS       Knowledge Advancement and Support
NRF       National Research Foundation
PI        Principal Investigator
RISA      Research and Innovation Support Agency
RE        Reviews and Evaluation
SA        South Africa
SADC      Southern African Development Community
ANNEXURE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Score / 4</th>
<th>Weight (Total = 100%)</th>
<th>Weighted score (Total = 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethical research</td>
<td>If relevant, have ethical considerations been addressed?⁳</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Hurdle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment with funding instrument</td>
<td>Does the proposal meet the objectives of the funding instrument?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Hurdle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Scientific merit and feasibility</td>
<td>Reflect on the rationale, approach and proposed methodology.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflect on the articulation or definition of the concept of community engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflect on the proposed conditions for knowledge generation as part of the processes of engagement in communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track record of applicant</td>
<td>Past research</td>
<td>Publications, patents, designs, performances, etc.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and redress</td>
<td>Of applicant</td>
<td>Black, female or disabled = 4 Black male, young⁴ = 4 Black male, not young = 3 White female, young = 3 White female, not young = 2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of students supervised</td>
<td>M and D degrees.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Academic collaborators</td>
<td>This will include collaborations at both an international and national level. Are the roles of these collaborators clearly indicated in the proposal?</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁳ Ethical considerations and clearances for grant proposals are the responsibility of the research institute and/or institution of the applicant. Where such ethical considerations and clearances are required, grant applicants will be expected to submit to the NRF signed statements and/or copies of clearance certificates before any grant funds are released.

⁴ 5 years post PhD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Score / 4</th>
<th>Weight (Total = 100%)</th>
<th>Weighted score (Total = 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With the communities</td>
<td>Are the roles of these team members clearly indicated in the proposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td>Human and Research Capacity Development</td>
<td>Are students appropriately embedded in the research proposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on knowledge production/field</td>
<td>How does the research advance discovery and understanding in the field?</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data management and use</td>
<td>Data management plan</td>
<td>A data management plan (DMP) is a formal document that describes the</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>data you expect to acquire or generate during the course of a research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project, how you will manage, describe, analyze, and store those data,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and what mechanisms (including digital data storage) you will use at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the end of your project to share and preserve your data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposal Grading

**Community Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Meaning of score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Application demonstrates evidence of outstanding performance across all the stated criteria, as determined by the panel and relative to the knowledge field under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>Above average performance across all criteria, as determined by the panel and relative to the knowledge field under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Application demonstrates average performance across all the stated criteria, as determined by the panel and relative to the knowledge field under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>Below average performance across all the criteria, as determined by panel and relative to knowledge field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>There are major shortcomings or flaws within and across the stated criteria, with particular emphasis on the scientific/scholarly merit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context:**
Proposal grading is done with sensitivity to the context within which each application is submitted. The score of each criterion for each application will be contextualised to accommodate variability in such things as knowledge fields, institutional capacity, etc. Should a criterion not be applicable to a specific application (e.g. plans for digital data storage; collaborations; etc.), the weighting of that specific criteria will be made to equal zero, and the overall score normalised.