2015 SANAP CALL FOR PROPOSALS

3rd SANAP SYMPOSIUM
3-6 JUNE 2014

Tracy Klarenbeek

Tracy@nrf.ac.za

Envisaged call timelines

- End June 2014 call open (4-6 weeks)
- Peer review 2 months
- End September 2014 panel process
- Early October 2014 panel outcomes

Support period

- 3 year cycle of funding: 2015 – 2017

Budget

- R 15 million pa (students/ running/ equipment/ expedition member salaries)

Open Call

- *"Interim"* call (pending direction from outcomes of SO&A Research Plan and Marine, Southern Ocean and Antarctic Research Strategy process (+/- March 2015)
- Demand-driven
- No stipulated research themes
- 6 disciplinary areas
  - Earth Sciences
  - Engineering Sciences
  - Life Sciences
  - Oceanographic Sciences
  - Physical Sciences
  - Social Sciences, Law and Humanities

Important Processes – *Call Opens*

- Notification via institutional research office and community email

- Online System – Register, update CV, don't wait for the last minute

- Select SANAP Call, note attachments, especially the Framework Document, and call requirements (DEA forms)

- 4 important sections: Research; budget; logistics requirements; environmental impact requirements

- Online system – Office-hours helpdesk available

Important Processes - *Call Closes*

- Deadlines system driven, auditable, final
- Kicks off NRF reviews and evaluation processes
  - Applications to DEA for inputs relating to Environmental Impact Assessment requirements and Logistics
  - Applications to DST for inputs relating to alignment with funding instrument
  - Postal peer review (6 applicant selected; 6 NRF selected – aim for 3 usable reviews)
  - Period required 6 – 8 weeks
  - Parallel process of panel selection (national and international panel member selection)

Important Processes – *Review Panel*

- Local and international (?) academic experts (approximately 8 in total) plus representatives from NRF; DST and DEA (Logistics and Environmental Assessments)

- All have prior access to all panel documents

- Assess value of Review Reports

- Score applications against scorecard criteria

- Advise on logistics / environmental requirements and on budget requests

Important Processes – *Post-Panel*

- NRF ranking of applications according to score
- Top-slice funding based on 2015 allocation (thus funding is demand-driven)
- Minimum scorecard score of 2 required to qualify for funding
- Approximately 15% over-allocation
- Prepare and submit feedback for unsuccessful applicants
- Communicate outcomes to applicants and institutional Designated Authorities
- Signed conditions of grants and other NRF administrative requirements

2015 SANAP CALL FOR FUNDING

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Details	Weight (Total = 100%)
Ethics	Ethical research	If relevant, have ethical considerations been addressed?	Hurdle
Proposal	Alignment with funding instrument	Does the proposal meet the objectives of the funding instrument?	Hurdle
	Scientific merit and feasibility	Reflect on the scientific/scholarly objectives. Has knowledge of relevant literature been articulated? Are the approach and methods suitable to the research objectives? Is the research well-planned and achievable within the stipulated timeframes?	50%

2015 SANAP CALL FOR FUNDING

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Details	Weight (Total = 100%)
Track record of applicant	Past students (graduated)	M and D degrees.	6%
	Past research	Publications, etc.	6%
Equity and redress	Of applicant	BF; BM, young = 4 BM, not; WF, young = 3 WF, not; WM, young = 2 WM, not = 1.	5%
	Of students supervised	M and D degrees.	5%
Collaboration	With other individuals (Do they add value?)	National and international. Are collaborator roles clearly indicated in the proposal?	2%
	Within a team (Is it appropriate?)	Are team member roles clearly indicated in the proposal?	3%

2015 SANAP CALL FOR FUNDING

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Details	Weight (Total = 100%)
Impacts	Expected research outputs	Scientific products, e.g., publications, etc. as relevant	5%
	Impact on knowledge production/field	How does the research advance discovery and understanding in the field?	10%
	Human and Research Capacity Development	Are students appropriately embedded in the research proposal? Will the proposed research further the academic development of junior researchers?	5%
	Plans for digital data storage, usage and/or dissemination	If relevant, are the proposed plans appropriate?	5%
			100%

2015 SANAP CALL FOR FUNDING

Proposal Grading

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

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.