



SSHRC CRSH

350 Albert Street, P.O. Box 1610
Ottawa ON K1P 6G4

350, rue Albert, C.P. 1610
Ottawa ON K1P 6G4

RESEARCH GRANTS AND PARTNERSHIPS DIVISION –
DIVISION DES SUBVENTIONS DE RECHERCHE ET DES PARTENARIATS

May 11, 2018

Dr. Brady James Deaton
Department of Food, Agricultural and
Resource Economics
University of Guelph
J.D. MacLachlan Bldg.
50 Stone Road East
GUELPH ON N1G 2W1

SSHRC ref.: 435-2018-0060

Dear Dr. Deaton:

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) has completed the merit review of the applications submitted to the Insight Grants competition. I am pleased to inform you that SSHRC is offering a grant for the abovementioned application.

SSHRC's decision rests upon the recommendation of the selection committee, which assessed the applications on the basis of the established evaluation criteria in accordance with their relative merit.

Also included as part of this result package are the following documents:

- A **Notice of Award** which contains award details including Terms and Conditions;
- A **Notice of Decision** which provides application, committee and overall competition results;
- The **external assessment memo**;
- All **external assessments received**; and
- The **committee evaluation form** (where applicable).

Your institution has also been informed of the standing (sextile) of your application in relation to the other applications submitted to the competition.

As a federal agency, SSHRC is responsible for demonstrating to Canadians the value and contributions of social sciences and humanities research in our society. As a recipient of SSHRC funding, you have an important role to play in communicating your research to others both within the research community and across society. In this regard, we request that you acknowledge the financial support received from SSHRC in all forms of communication. Additional information pertaining to this regulation is available on the [Acknowledging SSHRC](#) page of its website.

For the membership of the selection committee, please see the [Selection Committees](#) page on SSHRC's website.

Should you have further questions, contact: insightgrants@sshrc-crsh.gc.ca.

Please accept my warmest congratulations on your success in this competition and my very best wishes for a productive period of research activity.

Sincerely,



Tim Wilson, PhD
Executive Director



Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en
sciences humaines du Canada

www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca

Canada



NOTICE OF AWARD

Insight Grants

File Number

435-2018-0060

Grant Period

March 15, 2018 to March 31, 2023

Award Holder's Name and Address

Dr. Brady James Deaton
Department of Food, Agricultural and
Resource Economics
U of Guelph, J.D. MacLachlan Bldg.
50 Stone Road East
GUELPH ON N1G2W1

Payee

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH
OFFICE OF RESEARCH
50 STONE RD E
GUELPH ON N1G2W1

Co-investigator(s)

Dr. Christopher Alcantara
Dr. Sheri A. Longboat

The University of Western Ontario
University of Guelph

Title: Collaborative water services between First Nations and municipalities in Ontario

Fiscal Year(s)	Requested Amount	Awarded Amount
2017-2018		\$46,140
2018-2019	\$97,000	\$46,138
2019-2020	\$98,000	\$93,229
2020-2021	\$87,430	\$83,174
2021-2022	\$94,370	\$89,776
2022-2023	\$13,500	\$12,843
Total	\$390,300	\$371,300

Subsequent installments, if any, are subject to the availability of funds.

Conditions

By drawing on the funding awarded by SSHRC, and/or participating in the activities it supports, you affirm that you have read, understood and agreed to the following policies, responsibilities and obligations, and with any amendments to these that SSHRC may adopt.

1. a. The Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research:
<http://www.rcr.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/framework-cadre/>
- b. The Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans:
<http://www.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/initiatives/tcps2-eptc2/Default/>
- c. The Tri-Agency Financial Administration Guide:
http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/Professors-Professeurs/FinancialAdminGuide-GuideAdminFinancier/index_eng.asp
- d. The Public Communications Policy:
<http://science.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=711200B1-1>
- e. SSHRC's Intellectual Property and Copyright Policy:
http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/policies-politiques/g_copyright-s_droits_auteur-eng.aspx
- f. The relevant SSHRC funding opportunity description on SSHRC's website:
<http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/index-eng.aspx>
- g. The Tri-Agency Open Access Policy on Publications:
<http://www.science.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=F6765465-1>

It is your responsibility to ensure that you agree and can comply with all of these terms and conditions before you accept this funding.

If you have any concerns about your ability to comply with the terms and conditions of the award set out in this document, contact your institution's Research Grant Officer or the appropriate institutional official as well as SSHRC at the email address provided in your result letter immediately.

You must inform SSHRC immediately and in writing if there are any substantive changes to the individuals or institution (payee, and where relevant: co-investigator(s), collaborator(s) or partner(s)) involved in your funded research or research-related activity.

2. Disclosure of information related to your award

You will ensure that individuals who are named in any document(s) related to your award have agreed to be included and to disclose their personal information in the document(s).

You consent to the sharing among the three federal granting agencies (Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and SSHRC) and with any academic institution to which you are, or may become, affiliated, of any and all information, including personal information, in any way related to the administration and merit-review of the application and to administration of the award.

3. Eligibility

In the event of any change in your eligibility status, you will inform SSHRC staff responsible for your funding opportunity and your institutional official immediately.

If there is a failure to demonstrate the continued eligibility to hold the award or need for funds (as applicable), the agency reserves the right to terminate the award, or require upon demand that the award holder repay all or part of the award together with interest from the date of the first payment.

You confirm that you are not currently ineligible to apply for and/or hold funds from CIHR, NSERC, SSHRC or any other research or research funding organization worldwide for reasons of breach of policies on responsible conduct of research, such as ethics, integrity or financial management policies.

If you are a current or former public servant or public office holder to whom the Conflict of Interest Act (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-36.65/page-2.html>), the Policy on Conflict of Interest and Post-Employment (<https://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=25178>), or the Values and Ethics Code for the Public Sector (<http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=25049>) applies, you will not derive direct benefit from the award unless the provision or receipt of such benefits is in compliance with such legislation and codes.

5. If you fail to comply with any of the above, you may be subject to the process and recourse outlined in the Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research.

6. Disclosure of Personal Information in the event of policy breach

At the time of application, you agreed that, in case of a serious breach of Agency policy (as defined in the Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research) the Agency may publicly disclose any information relevant to the breach that is in the public interest, including your name, the nature of the breach, the institution where you were enrolled at the time of the breach, your current institution, and the recourse imposed against you.

7. In addition, you understand that the following documents pertain to the information SSHRC collects, uses and discloses from and about you:

- the Access to Information Act: <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/A-1/>
- the Privacy Act: <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/P-21/>
- the Collection, Use and Disclosure of Personal Information regulation: http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/policies-politiques/g_personal_info-s_info_personnelles-eng.aspx

The Public Communications Policy (<http://www.science.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=711200B1-1>) explains institutional and agency responsibilities surrounding public announcements related to funding.

8. Reporting Requirements

Requirement	Due Date	Access to report	Responsibility
Statement of Account	June 30 every year of the grant period	Statement of Account: http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/using-utiliser/grant_regulations-reglement_subventions/pdfs/statement300_e.pdf	Administering Organization and Award Holder
Achievement Report	Six months after the end of the grant period	Achievement report: http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/using-utiliser/achievement-realisation/reports-rapports-eng.aspx	Award Holder

Further Information

- For additional enquiries, please contact: insightgrants@sshrc-crsh.gc.ca
- For enquiries relating to the payment and/or administration of this grant, please contact SSHRC financial services at: grantsadministration@nserc-crsng.gc.ca



Tim Wilson, PhD
Executive Director
Research Grants and Partnerships Division



Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada
Committee Evaluation
Insight Grants October 2017 Competition

Committee:	435-23 (Multidisciplinary Social Sciences)
File Number:	435-2018-0060
Applicant Name:	Deaton, Brady James
Application Title:	Collaborative water services between First Nations and municipalities in Ontario

Challenge - The aim and importance of the endeavour (40%)

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory-Good	Good-Very Good	Very Good-Excellent
		< 3.0	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.9	5.0-6.0
Originality, significance and expected contribution to knowledge				x	
Appropriateness of the literature review				x	
Appropriateness of the theoretical approach or framework				x	
Appropriateness of the methods/approach				x	
Quality of training and mentoring to be provided to students, emerging scholars and other highly qualified personnel, and opportunities for them to contribute				x	
Potential for the project results to have influence and impact within and/or beyond the social sciences and humanities research community					x

Feasibility - The plan to achieve excellence (20%)

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory-Good	Good-Very Good	Very Good-Excellent
		< 3.0	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.9	5.0-6.0
Probability that the objectives will be met within the timeline proposed				x	
Appropriateness of the requested budget and justification of proposed costs			x		

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada
Committee Evaluation
Insight Grants October 2017 Competition

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory-Good	Good-Very Good	Very Good-Excellent
		< 3.0	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.9	5.0-6.0
Indications of financial and in-kind contributions from other sources, where appropriate	x				
Quality and appropriateness of knowledge mobilization plans, including effective dissemination with stakeholders within and/or beyond the research community, where applicable				x	
Appropriateness of the strategies for conducting the activity/activities proposed				x	

Capability - The expertise to succeed (40%)

Sub-criteria (No specific weight assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory-Good	Good-Very Good	Very Good-Excellent
		< 3.0	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.9	5.0-6.0
Quality, quantity and significance of past experience and published and/or creative outputs of the applicant and any co-applicants, relative to their roles in the project and their respective stages of career					x
Evidence of other knowledge mobilization activities (e.g. films, performances, commissioned reports, knowledge syntheses, experience in collaboration/other interactions with stakeholders, contributions to public debate and media), and of impacts on professional practice, social services and policies, etc.				x	
Evidence of contributions to the development of talent					x
Potential of the applicant/co-applicant to make future contributions					x

NOTICE OF DECISION

Applicant and Institution Information		Application Information	
Name: Dr. Brady James Deaton		Funding Opportunity: Insight Grants	
Institution:		File Number: 435-2018-0060	
Department of Food, Agricultural and Resource Economics U of Guelph, J.D. MacLachlan Bldg. 50 Stone Road East GUELPH ON N1G 2W1		Stream Type: Stream B	
		Title: Collaborative water services between First Nations and municipalities in Ontario	
		Decision: Funding Offered	

Application Results	Committee Results	Overall Competition Results
Your scores within committee:		
Challenge (40%): 4.70 / 6	Committee Name:	Applications: 1536
Feasibility (20%): 4.40 / 6	23 - Multidisciplinary Social Sciences	Grants Offered: 727 (47.33%)
Capability (40%): 5.17 / 6	Stream A	Grants Not Offered: 809 (52.67%)
Total Score (weighted): 14.48 / 18	Applications: 30	Sextile Categories:
Rank: 11 / 59	Grants Offered: 12 (40.00%)	First: 256 offered
	Grants Not Offered: 18 (60.00%)	Second: 256 offered
	Score of last funded application: 10.78	Third: 215 offered/ 41 not offered
Sextile category within overall competition: Second	Stream B	Fourth: 256 not offered
	Applications: 59	Fifth and sixth: 512 not offered
	Grants Offered: 23 (38.98%)	
	Grants Not Offered: 36 (61.00%)	
	Score of last funded application: 12.00	

Committee Recommendation
The committee recommended that this meritorious proposal be funded. At the same time, it considered that the proposed research could be accomplished with less than the amount requested. In particular, it found that savings could be made in the areas of Travel and subsistence costs and Non-disposable equipment.

Questions? Email: insightgrants@sshrc-crsh.gc.ca



External Assessments / Évaluations externes

Please find enclosed a copy of all the assessment material received on your grant application.

The number indicated on the assessment(s) is for administrative purposes only. **This number does not indicate the number of assessments received or requested, nor that the material is incomplete.**

Any assessment received too late to be shown to the adjudication committee is provided for your information only.

Veuillez trouver ci-joint toute la documentation reçue pour votre demande de subvention.

Le numéro apparaissant sur l'évaluation (les évaluations) est utilisé pour des fins administratives seulement. **Il n'indique pas le nombre d'évaluations reçues ou demandées, ni que la documentation est incomplète.**

Toute évaluation reçue après la réunion du comité de sélection est transmise à titre d'information.



SSHRC CRSH

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
Application Number: 435-2018-0060
Assessor Number: 2

Insight Grants

External Assessment Form

Assessment

Instructions: Evaluations by external assessors are intended to assist the committee in its deliberations. SSHRC is extremely grateful for your expertise as well as your time and effort.

Given the competitive nature of the adjudication process, constructive criticism and/or suggestions for improvement, if appropriate, may be helpful to the applicant.

As your assessment will be made available to the applicant, please do not include any personal identifying information. If such information appears in your document, the Council reserves the right to remove it.

Declarations on confidentiality and conflict of interest

- a) The information provided in the applications is protected by Canada's *Privacy Act* and is made available to external assessors for reviewing purposes only. I therefore agree to treat as strictly confidential all the material from the above-mentioned file which has been submitted to me by the Council. After responding, be it positively or negatively, I will ensure the destruction of the said material.

Agree	X
-------	---

- b) I attest that I am not in a conflict of interest with the applicant(s).

Agree	X
-------	---

Using the guidelines in the attached document, evaluate each sub-criteria below and check the appropriate box. Briefly explain your response.

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
 Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
 Application Number: 435-2018-0060
 Assessor Number: 2

Part 1: Challenge – The aim and importance of the endeavour

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
a) Originality, significance and expected contribution to knowledge					X
b) Appropriateness of the literature review				X	
c) Appropriateness of the theoretical approach or framework				X	
d) Appropriateness of the methods/approach				X	
e) Quality of training and mentoring to be provided to students, emerging scholars and other highly qualified personnel, and opportunities for them to contribute					X
f) Potential for the project results to have influence and impact within and/or beyond the social sciences and humanities research community.					X

g) Briefly describe the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the above criteria:

The project deals with an important and timely issue: provision of good quality water to Indigenous communities. The mixed methodology approach is appropriate: employ quantitative analysis with available data (and creation of this dataset is a large contribution) and supplement with qualitative analysis that controls for different factors. The training opportunities for students are excellent and the project will produce a number of HQP and Indigenous community researchers with relevant and highly useful training.

This is an innovative and transdisciplinary project that promises to provide great value to many communities.

Part 2: Feasibility – The plan to achieve excellence

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
a) Probability that the objectives will be met within the timeline proposed					X
b) Appropriateness of the requested budget, and justification of proposed costs					X
c) Indications of financial and in-kind contributions from other sources, where appropriate				X	

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
 Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
 Application Number: 435-2018-0060
 Assessor Number: 2

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
d) Quality and appropriateness of knowledge mobilization plans, including effective dissemination, exchange and engagement with stakeholders within and/or beyond the research community, where applicable					X
e) Appropriateness of the strategies for conducting the activity/activities proposed					X

f) Briefly describe the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the above criteria:

I think the use of a project coordinator and community research assistants will greatly benefit the project and allow this ambitious project to be completed in a timely fashion. The creation of the dataset will be a valuable contribution, as will the data from the qualitative interviews.

I like the use of the op-ed and podcast methods for providing novel ways of KM.

Part 3: Capability – The expertise to succeed

Please note that in the case of a research team, you will need to evaluate the strength and suitability of the team members' research achievements (do not include collaborators).

In your evaluation of this scholar's or team's capability to succeed, address the following criteria while considering his/her career stage:

Sub-criteria (No specific weight assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
a) Quality, quantity and significance of past experience and published and/or creative outputs of the applicant and any co-applicants, relative to their roles in the project and their respective stages of career				X	
b) Evidence of other knowledge mobilization activities (e.g. films, performances, commissioned reports, knowledge syntheses, experience in collaboration/other interactions with stakeholders, contributions to public debate and media), and of impacts on professional practice, social services and policies, etc.				X	
c) Evidence of contributions to the development of talent					X

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
Application Number: 435-2018-0060
Assessor Number: 2

Sub-criteria (No specific weight assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
d) Potential of the applicant/co-applicant to make future contributions					X

e) Briefly describe the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the above criteria:

The skills of the applicant and co-applicants are complementary and will ensure that this innovative transdisciplinary project will be successful. The team approach is necessary and well-thought out. The project is well conceived and clear in its timelines, as well as the justifications for the approach taken. It is important to note that all three applicants have long experience in working with Indigenous communities and are aware of the challenges associated with this type of research.

Part 4: Additional Comments

a) If you have comments regarding the budget or other aspects of the proposal, please include them here:

This is a highly innovative and worthy project.



SSHRC CRSH

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
Application Number: 435-2018-0060
Assessor Number: 6

Insight Grants

External Assessment Form

Assessment

Instructions: Evaluations by external assessors are intended to assist the committee in its deliberations. SSHRC is extremely grateful for your expertise as well as your time and effort.

Given the competitive nature of the adjudication process, constructive criticism and/or suggestions for improvement, if appropriate, may be helpful to the applicant.

As your assessment will be made available to the applicant, please do not include any personal identifying information. If such information appears in your document, the Council reserves the right to remove it.

Declarations on confidentiality and conflict of interest

- a) The information provided in the applications is protected by Canada's *Privacy Act* and is made available to external assessors for reviewing purposes only. I therefore agree to treat as strictly confidential all the material from the above-mentioned file which has been submitted to me by the Council. After responding, be it positively or negatively, I will ensure the destruction of the said material.

Agree	X
-------	---

- b) I attest that I am not in a conflict of interest with the applicant(s).

Agree	X
-------	---

Using the guidelines in the attached document, evaluate each sub-criteria below and check the appropriate box. Briefly explain your response.



Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
Application Number: 435-2018-0060
Assessor Number: 6

Part 1: Challenge – The aim and importance of the endeavour

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
a) Originality, significance and expected contribution to knowledge					X
b) Appropriateness of the literature review					X
c) Appropriateness of the theoretical approach or framework				X	
d) Appropriateness of the methods/approach					X
e) Quality of training and mentoring to be provided to students, emerging scholars and other highly qualified personnel, and opportunities for them to contribute				X	
f) Potential for the project results to have influence and impact within and/or beyond the social sciences and humanities research community.					X

g) Briefly describe the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the above criteria:

Strengths:

- Salience:** This proposal promises results that have tremendous practical significance. Access to safe drinking water on Canadian FN reservations is of utmost importance. The Trudeau government has promised meaningful change, it is research like this that can deliver on that promise.
- Legitimacy:** The PI and small research team are well placed and prepared to undertake this research. The PI is well known to be a thoughtful and rigorous scholar, who goes beyond the academy to deliver meaningful results. My only concern about legitimacy is that I would like to see more explicit evidence that First Nations and municipalities have requested and actively support the research.
- Credibility:** The PI is highly regarded in the field of agricultural and resource economics in Canada, and one of the few applied economists working explicitly on First Nations issues.

Weaknesses:

I like this proposal very much, and strongly endorse its funding. My only minor concern is listed above under legitimacy.

Part 2: Feasibility – The plan to achieve excellence

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
a) Probability that the objectives will be met within the timeline proposed					X

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
Application Number: 435-2018-0060
Assessor Number: 6

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
b) Appropriateness of the requested budget, and justification of proposed costs					X
c) Indications of financial and in-kind contributions from other sources, where appropriate					X
d) Quality and appropriateness of knowledge mobilization plans, including effective dissemination, exchange and engagement with stakeholders within and/or beyond the research community, where applicable					X
e) Appropriateness of the strategies for conducting the activity/activities proposed					X

f) Briefly describe the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the above criteria:

I find the full proposal to be very compelling and have no concerns with the activities or the budget allocation that is proposed. I like the knowledge mobilization plan, and have every confidence that the researchers will deliver.

Part 3: Capability – The expertise to succeed

Please note that in the case of a research team, you will need to evaluate the strength and suitability of the team members' research achievements (do not include collaborators).

In your evaluation of this scholar's or team's capability to succeed, address the following criteria while considering his/her career stage:

Sub-criteria (No specific weight assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
a) Quality, quantity and significance of past experience and published and/or creative outputs of the applicant and any co-applicants, relative to their roles in the project and their respective stages of career					X

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
Application Number: 435-2018-0060
Assessor Number: 6

Sub-criteria (No specific weight assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
b) Evidence of other knowledge mobilization activities (e.g. films, performances, commissioned reports, knowledge syntheses, experience in collaboration/other interactions with stakeholders, contributions to public debate and media), and of impacts on professional practice, social services and policies, etc.					X
c) Evidence of contributions to the development of talent				X	
d) Potential of the applicant/co-applicant to make future contributions					X

e) Briefly describe the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the above criteria:

Excellent. My only question is whether the case study research can be done in an action research mode that builds the capacity of the interested groups.

Part 4: Additional Comments

a) If you have comments regarding the budget or other aspects of the proposal, please include them here:

None.



SSHRC CRSH

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
Application Number: 435-2018-0060
Assessor Number: 11

Insight Grants

External Assessment Form

Assessment

Instructions: Evaluations by external assessors are intended to assist the committee in its deliberations. SSHRC is extremely grateful for your expertise as well as your time and effort.

Given the competitive nature of the adjudication process, constructive criticism and/or suggestions for improvement, if appropriate, may be helpful to the applicant.

As your assessment will be made available to the applicant, please do not include any personal identifying information. If such information appears in your document, the Council reserves the right to remove it.

Declarations on confidentiality and conflict of interest

- a) The information provided in the applications is protected by Canada's *Privacy Act* and is made available to external assessors for reviewing purposes only. I therefore agree to treat as strictly confidential all the material from the above-mentioned file which has been submitted to me by the Council. After responding, be it positively or negatively, I will ensure the destruction of the said material.

Agree	X
-------	---

- b) I attest that I am not in a conflict of interest with the applicant(s).

Agree	X
-------	---

Using the guidelines in the attached document, evaluate each sub-criteria below and check the appropriate box. Briefly explain your response.



Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
 Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
 Application Number: 435-2018-0060
 Assessor Number: 11

Part 1: Challenge – The aim and importance of the endeavour

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
a) Originality, significance and expected contribution to knowledge					X
b) Appropriateness of the literature review			X		
c) Appropriateness of the theoretical approach or framework					X
d) Appropriateness of the methods/approach					X
e) Quality of training and mentoring to be provided to students, emerging scholars and other highly qualified personnel, and opportunities for them to contribute				X	
f) Potential for the project results to have influence and impact within and/or beyond the social sciences and humanities research community.					X

g) Briefly describe the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the above criteria:

This is a highly critical and urgent area of research with results that will have the ability to positively impact First Nations communities. The focus on deeply considering First Nations' attitudes will help inform policy change to create better health and wellbeing outcomes for First Nations' communities with access to drinking water.

I hope and expect that an important part of the training and mentoring will be to focus on supporting enabling the co-applicant Professor Sheri Longboat to build her CV. I hope that the project enables supports her to be first lead author as much as possible in this project and for her to be supported develop a stand alone sole authored article from this research that addresses her research strengths focusing on Indigenous research methodology.

Literature review could have been strengthened. There is a lot of writing about Indigenous peoples including drinking water. All of this research notes the urgency of this issue. This was a weak part of the application. A Quick online search brings up this work. For example see:

- Jerry White, Laura Murphy, Nicholas Spence "Water and Indigenous Peoples: Canada's Paradox" The International Indigenous Policy Journal 2012
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=10938>
- Brand Brown et al "Why Do Some First Nations Communities Have Safe Water and Others Not? Socioeconomic Determinants of Drinking Water Risk" Global Journal of Health Science 2016
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5064062/>
- Lori Bradford et al "Drinking water quality in Indigenous communities in Canada and health outcome review" in International Journal of Circumpolar Health
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4967713/>
- Indigenous Communities: Analyzing their Right to Water under Different International Legal Regimes Law Review 2014
- Bradford Morse "Indigenous peoples and water rights: does the United Nations' adoption of the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples help?" Journal of Water Law 2009 (noting this article has a focus on drinking water quality)

Part 2: Feasibility – The plan to achieve excellence

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
 Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
 Application Number: 435-2018-0060
 Assessor Number: 11

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
a) Probability that the objectives will be met within the timeline proposed					X
b) Appropriateness of the requested budget, and justification of proposed costs					X
c) Indications of financial and in-kind contributions from other sources, where appropriate	X				
d) Quality and appropriateness of knowledge mobilization plans, including effective dissemination, exchange and engagement with stakeholders within and/or beyond the research community, where applicable				X	
e) Appropriateness of the strategies for conducting the activity/activities proposed				X	

f) Briefly describe the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the above criteria:

Are Community Research Assistants being valued appropriately in the research budget? They will bring unique and valuable knowledge but have half the budget allocation that the Graduate Research Assistants.

Why has Longboat and Alcantara only been budgeted to attend one domestic conference in years 3 and 4 (compared to PI who will attend international and domestic conferences?)

I don't believe this research should be done without an Indigenous researcher on the team. There is an Indigenous researcher on the team which is excellent but all efforts should be made to ensure the rapid building of her outputs. While she already has many conference papers, and needs more publications, I just wondered about this part of the budget.

Part 3: Capability – The expertise to succeed

Please note that in the case of a research team, you will need to evaluate the strength and suitability of the team members' research achievements (do not include collaborators).

In your evaluation of this scholar's or team's capability to succeed, address the following criteria while considering his/her career stage:

Sub-criteria (No specific weight assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
--	-----	----------------	------	-----------	-----------

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
 Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
 Application Number: 435-2018-0060
 Assessor Number: 11

Sub-criteria (No specific weight assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
a) Quality, quantity and significance of past experience and published and/or creative outputs of the applicant and any co-applicants, relative to their roles in the project and their respective stages of career					X
b) Evidence of other knowledge mobilization activities (e.g. films, performances, commissioned reports, knowledge syntheses, experience in collaboration/other interactions with stakeholders, contributions to public debate and media), and of impacts on professional practice, social services and policies, etc.					X
c) Evidence of contributions to the development of talent			X		
d) Potential of the applicant/co-applicant to make future contributions					X

e) Briefly describe the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the above criteria:

This is a strong team who have a clear focus and have already built relationships with the relevant communities which is critical to the success of this project.

Part 4: Additional Comments

a) If you have comments regarding the budget or other aspects of the proposal, please include them here:

This is a strong proposal and I strongly support it being funded.



SSHRC CRSH

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
Application Number: 435-2018-0060
Assessor Number: 14

Insight Grants

External Assessment Form

Assessment

Instructions: Evaluations by external assessors are intended to assist the committee in its deliberations. SSHRC is extremely grateful for your expertise as well as your time and effort.

Given the competitive nature of the adjudication process, constructive criticism and/or suggestions for improvement, if appropriate, may be helpful to the applicant.

As your assessment will be made available to the applicant, please do not include any personal identifying information. If such information appears in your document, the Council reserves the right to remove it.

Declarations on confidentiality and conflict of interest

- a) The information provided in the applications is protected by Canada's *Privacy Act* and is made available to external assessors for reviewing purposes only. I therefore agree to treat as strictly confidential all the material from the above-mentioned file which has been submitted to me by the Council. After responding, be it positively or negatively, I will ensure the destruction of the said material.

Agree	X
-------	---

- b) I attest that I am not in a conflict of interest with the applicant(s).

Agree	X
-------	---

Using the guidelines in the attached document, evaluate each sub-criteria below and check the appropriate box. Briefly explain your response.

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
 Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
 Application Number: 435-2018-0060
 Assessor Number: 14

Part 1: Challenge – The aim and importance of the endeavour

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
a) Originality, significance and expected contribution to knowledge				X	
b) Appropriateness of the literature review		X			
c) Appropriateness of the theoretical approach or framework			X		
d) Appropriateness of the methods/approach		X			
e) Quality of training and mentoring to be provided to students, emerging scholars and other highly qualified personnel, and opportunities for them to contribute				X	
f) Potential for the project results to have influence and impact within and/or beyond the social sciences and humanities research community.		X			

g) Briefly describe the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the above criteria:

I am really torn about this proposal. On the one hand, it is a very important topic. As the investors note, clean drinking water infrastructure on Indigenous reserves is a national disgrace and deserves some serious attention that would lead to better policy approaches. And I think it is a very interesting team of researchers assembled. On the other hand, this looks like two separate grant proposals, cobbled together without serious attention and thought, with some serious limitations as a consequence.

The section on statistical analysis from secondary documents seems fine as a stand alone undertaking. It would build upon extant research of the PI and others, although I worry about the datedness of the source material, while acknowledging the PI's statement with regard to the paucity of such data (one hopes a recommendation to address this would come out of such research). I think such an analysis could offer some useful data that could support useful recommendations. I think the work could be done without a SSHRC grant, or at least one of this size, but it is valid research. I'd have liked a bit more attention to the literature context, but it is acceptable.

The problem is in the qualitative piece, which seems to have no relation to the previous piece. This might not be true, but it reads as a very last minute effort by the PI to add some "sexy" elements without allowing the two co-investigators time (or perhaps commitment) to really develop this bit of the research or more effectively tie the whole thing in to a coherent grant. And that is a real shame. The qualitative questions badly need to be answered and (I know I'm jumping ahead here) the two co-investigators seem to have the skill set to do some really good research here, but not as is laid out and without a clear link to the quantitative piece.

I feel that far more needs to be articulated around the questions and concerns of the Indigenous governments they will be working with. I cannot discern that much in the way of collaboration on the research questions happened before the grant was

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
Application Number: 435-2018-0060
Assessor Number: 14

developed. There is some vague reference to ongoing talks, but this should have happened well before the grant was submitted and the Indigenous governments investment in the project should have been crystal clear. Again, I am surprised given the qualifications of the two co-investigators, I can only surmise this was a last minute addition. The actual research questions need to be much better articulated. More importantly, the description of the methodology is severely lacking and the reference to appropriate Indiginization of the methodologies is literally a mention in passing. Are the Indigenous governments on board with the questions and methods? What do they see as appropriate processes and outcomes? How much investment will they have in co-producing the knowledge and articulating their own experiences and knowledge? Far more work needs to be done here to allow a sustainable claim on respectful methodology and to assure the granting agency that the Nations will actually benefit if the work is funded. Given this, I cannot clearly see strong potential for the grant taken as a whole to clearly have influence and impact. But I believe if attention is given to these failings, a very good fundable grant could and should happen in the future, as this is a critical topic for investigation.

The proposal for training of students and to utilize a community research assistant seems standard.

Part 2: Feasibility – The plan to achieve excellence

Sub-criteria (No specific weighting assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
a) Probability that the objectives will be met within the timeline proposed		X			
b) Appropriateness of the requested budget, and justification of proposed costs			X		
c) Indications of financial and in-kind contributions from other sources, where appropriate		X			
d) Quality and appropriateness of knowledge mobilization plans, including effective dissemination, exchange and engagement with stakeholders within and/or beyond the research community, where applicable		X			
e) Appropriateness of the strategies for conducting the activity/activities proposed		X			

f) Briefly describe the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the above criteria:

My concerns as articulated above carry over and stand as stated. The knowledge mobilization plan is exceedingly poor and/or conventional, lots of academic

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
 Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
 Application Number: 435-2018-0060
 Assessor Number: 14

conferences (and why more for the more senior researcher? Surely the more junior colleagues should be prioritized as they are still building their academic presence?) and publications. A few interesting pieces (a podcast, translating reports into appropriate Indigenous language (nice, that)) do not raise this piece sufficiently to warrant a good ranking. Again, how have goals by the Indigenous governments been incorporated? Does one community report in the middle constitute sufficient opportunity for knowledge mobilization? Will they have what they need to progress at the end? What do the municipal governments need? What would they be looking for out of this research and how would they like to receive it? Is the one joint workshop sufficient or would multiple dialogue opportunities have been a better investment?

There appear to be no inkind contributions. One might have expected some from the municipalities. As there are no honoraria for the Indigenous Nations budgeted, should their very valuable time not be considered inkind?

The statistical analysis of secondary documents seems clear and acceptable. The rest of the research simply is not appropriate as laid out here.

Part 3: Capability – The expertise to succeed

Please note that in the case of a research team, you will need to evaluate the strength and suitability of the team members' research achievements (do not include collaborators).

In your evaluation of this scholar's or team's capability to succeed, address the following criteria while **considering his/her career stage**:

Sub-criteria (No specific weight assigned to each sub-criterion)	N/A	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
a) Quality, quantity and significance of past experience and published and/or creative outputs of the applicant and any co-applicants, relative to their roles in the project and their respective stages of career					X
b) Evidence of other knowledge mobilization activities (e.g. films, performances, commissioned reports, knowledge syntheses, experience in collaboration/other interactions with stakeholders, contributions to public debate and media), and of impacts on professional practice, social services and policies, etc.				X	
c) Evidence of contributions to the development of talent					X
d) Potential of the applicant/co-applicant to make future contributions					X

e) Briefly describe the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the above criteria:

Committee: Multidisciplinary Social Sciences
Applicant Name: Brady James Deaton
Application Number: 435-2018-0060
Assessor Number: 14

I really have no explanation for the quality of this submission, given the talents of the applicants within their respective fields. Within their fields I think they have great potential (and actual demonstration) of useful research. I look forward especially to seeing more from Dr. Longboat

Part 4: Additional Comments

a) If you have comments regarding the budget or other aspects of the proposal, please include them here: