



## Emergency Bridge Funding GUIDELINES St. George Campus

The primary responsibility to assist Principal Investigators who were not successful in their **grant renewals** rests with the **Department**. However, as has been the practice in past years, the Dean's Office is prepared to consider requests from the **Chair** for emergency bridge funding. Application requests are to be submitted to the Vice Dean, Research and International Relations. The purpose of bridge funding is to enable a Principal Investigator to resubmit the proposal in the next competition. **To be eligible for bridge funding, the application must show evidence that, for the unsuccessful grant renewal, the Principal Investigator:**

- 1) Had the proposal undergo internal science peer review in writing by arm's length colleague(s)
- 2) Had the proposal editorially reviewed by the Grant and Program Development team in the Vice Dean Research Office (Della Saunders or Sarah Carson), and
- 3) Contacted the Senior Development Officer, Foundation and Corporate Development, to discuss strategies for alternate funding (Sony Giwa)

In addition, the granting agency ranking and reviewer comments must be provided with the application for bridge funding.

The emergency bridge funds, to be approved by the Vice Dean, Research and Innovation, are limited to the St. George campus-eligible researchers. Individuals at the TAHSN Research Institutes should contact their Vice President Research Office to determine if a similar program exists. For grants held and managed off campus, the investigator and/or department should seek bridging support from the host institution.

Priority will be given to requests where: 1) the support of graduate students is at risk, and 2) without bridge funding, the investigator's research activity would face a complete shut-down.

The application for bridge funding should clearly state:

- 1) the current research budget situation of the investigator
- 2) how much funding the department is able to provide, and
- 3) the likelihood of success for a resubmission based on the funding agency reviews

Departments are strongly encouraged to institute an internal science peer review process. For two excellent models, please see: <http://www.deptmedicine.utoronto.ca/Research/internalgrant.htm>  
<http://www.physiology.utoronto.ca/res/grants.htm>

### Check List to Submit:

- 1) The unsuccessful grant and grant agency ranking with reviewer comments
- 2) Evidence that unsuccessful grant renewal was internally peer reviewed
- 3) Confirmation that unsuccessful grant renewal was sent to Grant and Program Development in the Faculty of Medicine Vice Dean Research office
- 4) Confirmation that the Senior Development Officer, Foundation and Corporate Development, was contacted to discuss alternate funding strategies
- 5) Explanation of how lack of funding will put support of graduate students at risk
- 6) Explanation that investigator's research will face shut-down without funding
- 7) Provision of current research budget situation
- 8) Amount of funding to be provided by the department
- 9) Likelihood of success for a resubmission