What CIHR Heard:

Analysis of Feedback on the Design Discussion Document

Annex I: Feedback on the Design Discussion Document Survey

PART A: Basic Information

1. Would you classify yourself as a:

    Please select all that apply:

       a. Early career researcher (<5 years as an independent researcher)
       b. Mid-career researcher (5-10 years as an independent researcher)
       c. Senior researcher (>10 years as an independent researcher)
       d. Knowledge User
       e. Other (specify):_____

2. Which research position(s) do you currently hold at this time?

    Please select all that apply:

       a. Professor
       b. Assistant Professor
       c. Associate Professor
       d. Researcher
       e. Research Assistant or similar position
       f. Clinician
       g. Intern
       h. Other (specify):_____

3. Which of the following is your primary research domain (pillar):
       a. Biomedical
       b. Clinical
       c. Health systems/services
       d. Social, cultural, environmental and population health

4. Have you peer reviewed for CIHR in the past 5 years?

       a. Yes
       b. No

5. Have you applied for an Open Operating Grant in the past 3 years?

       a. Yes
       b. No

If Yes, please answer Questions #6, 7 and 8:

6. On average, how long does it take you to prepare a full Open Operating Grants application package (including attachments) for electronic submission to ResearchNet (in hours)?

[Free form comment box]

7. Do you have an internal deadline at your institution that precedes the CIHR deadline for applications?

       a. Yes
       b. No

8. Do you have an internal peer review process at your institution?

       a. Yes
       b. No

PART B: Design Discussion Document

1. The Design Discussion Document adequately describes the challenges with our current Open Suite of Programs and peer review system.

   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree
   f. Don't Know

2. Having read the Design Discussion Document, the distinction between the Foundation/Programmatic Research Scheme and the Project Scheme is clear.

   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree
   f. Don't Know

3. Having read the Design Discussion Document, I would characterize myself as someone who would apply to:

   a. The Foundation/Programmatic Research Scheme
   b. The Project Scheme
   c. Both
   d. Neither

4. Having read the Design Discussion Document, I believe the proposed changes would reduce barriers to funding excellence across the full spectrum of health research.

   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree
   f. There are no barriers

5. As described in the Design Discussion Document, to what extent do you agree or disagree that the following design elements would help address CIHR's current challenges with its Open Suite of Programs and peer review system?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
Multi-phased competition process This design element is intended to screen the number of applicants that complete full applications and reduce the length of time required to review applications at each stage						
Application-focused review This design element is intended to match applications to reviewers to ensure the appropriate expertise is assigned to each application						
Integrated Knowledge Translation This design element is intended to recognize the importance of knowledge users, and would support collaborative, applied research						
Structured Review Criteria This design element is intended to provide clearly defined review criteria and relevant application information to support fair, reliable and consistent peer review evaluations						
Remote (virtual) screening process This design element is intended to utilize internet-assisted technology to support matching for application-focused review						

| College of Reviewers

This design element is intended to facilitate access to appropriate expertise, and provide the framework for mechanisms to recruit, train and reward reviewers						

6. What are the strengths of the design that is being considered?

[Free-form comment box]

7. What are the gaps in this design that CIHR should address to ensure a successful implementation?

[Free-form comment box]

8. What challenges do you anticipate as a researcher/peer reviewer in adopting these changes?

[Free-form comment box]

9. Other Comments:

[Free-form comment box]