

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Monday, June 07, 2010 7:34 PM  
To: CCUCC  
Subject: [ccucc-1] Follow up to last e-mail: Funding of Bin J

Dear all,

As you consult with your departments regarding [REDACTED]'s suggestions, I just wanted to make sure everyone was fully informed on the principles which guided the Executive Committee in making the funding decisions.

The Chemistry community over many years has pushed for selectivity in the awarding of grants. That is clearly evident in the average grant awarded by the Chemistry Evaluation Group: our average grant is \$55,092 which is approximately ~\$14,000 higher than the next highest average for an evaluation group and ~\$20,000 higher than the average grant of all Evaluation Groups. We maintained this principle in deciding not to reduce the bin values. I also worried that if we cut the bin levels this year, they may erode continually over time.

When faced with the decision to either not fund Bin J in its entirety or partially fund it; partially funding it was, in the opinion of the Executive Committee, the better option. The principles we used were the same principles which have guided former selection committees: fund the early career researchers; we funded both the ECR as defined by NSERC as well as the first renewals. Of the remaining 31 grants (all established researchers), we funded the 10 VSM and not the 21 SSS. For myself, that was based on my view, and the view expressed to me by many members of the community, that too much weight is based on the training of HQP and the evaluation of the excellence of the researcher is more objective than the other categories.

The option of decreasing all the grant levels for those awarded grants both last year and this year was not modeled or considered.

I look forward to the results of the poll.

[REDACTED]

---

ccucc-1 mailing list  
ccucc-1@uleth.ca  
<http://listserv.uleth.ca/mailman/listinfo/ccucc-1>