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CIHR UPDATES
Major Updates Since November 2015

• **2015-2016 Second Foundation Grant competition** is now completed and will support 120 research programs for a total of $292M over the next 7 years.

• **2016-2017 Foundation Grant competition** is well underway with an anticipated Stage 1 Notice of Decision in February 2017.

• **2016 first Project Grant competition** is now completed and will support 491 research grants, with an additional 127 bridge grants, for a total of $375,579,347 over five years.

• **Fall 2016 Project Grant competition** is well underway with an anticipated Notice of Decision in May 2017.

• **A Peer Review Working Group** was established under the leadership of Dr. Paul Kubes. A list of recommendations was developed to strengthen the peer review process for the Project Grant competition.

• **Appointments of the College of Reviewers Chairs** began on July 1, 2016 and the inaugural meeting was in October 2016.

• **The International Peer Review Panel** was launched in September 2016.
Peer Review Working Group
Peer Review Working Group

- To address concerns raised by the health research community regarding the reforms of the peer review process, CIHR hosted a Working Meeting with members of the research community on July 13, 2016.
- Following the meeting, a Peer Review Working Group was established and chaired by Dr. Paul Kubes, Executive Chair of the College of Reviewers.
- Together, we arrived at a consensus on concrete solutions that CIHR would implement to further strengthen the peer review process:

  - Face-to-face discussions will be restored and virtual online discussion will no longer be needed for the Project competitions.
  - Competition Chairs and Scientific Officers will oversee the review of a cluster of applications throughout the process.
  - A complementary iterative process will be implemented for Indigenous focused research.
Implementation of Recommendations – Application for the Project Grant Competition

Applicants may submit a maximum of two applications in the role of Nominated Principal Applicant (NPA) per competition.

Applications are completed in a 10 page “free-form” format (including figures and tables). Applicants can attach additional unlimited supporting material (references and letters of support).

Applications are assessed based on “significance and impact of the research” (25% of final score), “approaches and methods” (50% of the final score), and “expertise, experience and resources” (25% of final score).

The Common CV (CCV) for the Project Grant application includes publications from the past seven years and applicants can upload a PDF to supplement the CCV information if they have taken leaves of absence in the past seven years.

A one-page rebuttal is included in the revised structure to give the applicant the opportunity to explain how the application was improved since the previous submission.
Implementation of Recommendations – Stage 1 Review for the Project Grant Competition

**Competition Chairs** are paired with **Scientific Officers** to collaboratively manage a cluster of applications and assist CIHR with ensuring that **high quality reviewers** are assigned to all applications.

**Reviewer assignments** are approved by the **Competition Chairs** and **Scientific Officers**. In addition, Competition Chairs and Scientific Officers have the ability to remove or add reviewers once the reviewers have completed the new Conflict of Interest/Ability to Review (CAR) assessment for a group of applications.

Applicants can make **recommendations** regarding what **types of expertise** are required to review their applications.

Each application is assigned to **four (4)** reviewers at Stage 1.

Applicants can now be **reviewers at Stage 1** of the competition. However, they cannot participate in the cluster of applications containing their own applications.

The **asynchronous online discussion** was eliminated from the competition process.

CIHR has reverted to a **numeric scoring system** (0 - 100) to aid in ranking of applications for the Project Grant competition.
Implementation of Additional Recommendations –
Stage 1 Review for the Project Grant Competition

CIHR will host a **face-to-face meeting** with the Competition Chairs on November 18 and 25, 2016.

Competition Chairs are to be involved in the **recruitment of Scientific Officers** based on expertise required.
Implementation of Recommendations –
Stage 2 Review for the Project Grant Competition

Approximately 40% of applications reviewed at Stage 1 will move on to Stage 2 for a **face-to-face review** in Ottawa.

**Stage 1 reviewers’ comments** for applications that do not move on to Stage 2 will be reviewed by Competition Chairs and Scientific Officers to ensure appropriate review.

In order to increase accountability, **reviewer names** will accompany their reviews to the final assessment stage.

Applications moving to Stage 2 will be **reviewed by two of the original four reviewers** from Stage 1 during face-to-face meetings. They will be expected to present their own and the reviews of other two Stage 1 reviewers at the meetings.

The **applications will be ranked within each cluster for Stage 2**, as opposed to a ranking across face-to-face committees.
Implementation of Recommendations – Next Steps

CIHR will continue to work towards implementing all the peer review working group recommendations.

CIHR and its Science Council will carefully monitor and evaluate the competition, and consult on any future necessary changes.

We will share progress updates widely, as well as data from the Project Grant and Foundation Grant competitions after the results are released.
Peer Review Process
Recruitment of Reviewers
Peer Review Recruitment: Fall 2016 Project Grant and 2016-2017 Foundation Grant Competitions

• With the support of the College Chairs, the Peer Review Working Group has endorsed selection criteria for the recruitment of peer reviewers for the current Project Grant and Foundation Grant competitions.

• Reviewers who met the selection criteria were invited and asked to complete a reviewer profile in order to assist CIHR with appropriately matching applications to reviewers with the relevant expertise.

• CIHR grantees were strongly encouraged to review if invited.
Peer Review Recruitment: Fall 2016 Project Grant and 2016-2017 Foundation Grant Competitions

Reviewer Profile

- **Reviewer Overview**
  - Reviewer Type
  - First Independent Appointment
  - Reviewer Activities
  - Peer Review Language Ability

- **Expertise Overview**
  - Themes
  - CIHR Institutes
  - Areas of Science
  - Methods / Approaches
  - Populations
Foundation Grant Competition

2015 CIHR Foundation Grant Recipient
Dr. Lonnie Zwaigenbaum, University of Alberta
The Foundation Grant Overview

• The Foundation Grant supports a cadre of elite health researchers and contributes to a sustainable health research foundation.

• This is an opportunity for top Canadian scientists to focus on what they do best – innovate, create and advance science.

• This program is about funding on the promise of innovative vision for the future based on an outstanding track record.
The Foundation Grant is a multi-stage competition with 2 distinct applications and 3 review stages.

**Stage 1 – Caliber of the Applicant, and Vision and Program Direction**
- Submit Stage 1 Application
- Match application to reviewers
- Complete Stage 1 Remote Review

**Stage 2 – Quality of the Program, and Quality of the Expertise, Experience and Resources**
- Submit Stage 2 Application
- Match application to reviewers
- Complete Stage 2 Remote Review

**Stage 3 – Final Assessment**
- Separate Interdisciplinary Committee
- Complete Final Assessment

**Caliber of the Applicant (75%)**
- Leadership (25%)
- Significance of Contributions (25%)
- Productivity (25%)

**Vision and Program Direction (25%)**

**Quality of the Program (50%)**
- Research Concept (25%)
- Research Approach (25%)

**Quality of the Expertise, Experience and Resources (50%)**
- Expertise (20%)
- Mentorship and Training (20%)
- Quality of Support Environment (10%)

The committee is responsible for integrating the result of the Stage 2 reviews, with a focus on assessing applications that fall into the “grey zone” (i.e., applications that are close to the funding cut-off, and which demonstrate a high degree of variance in individual reviewer rankings).
2015-2016 Foundation Grant Competition

Stage 1
- Stage 1 Applicants
  - 911 applications submitted
- Stage 1 Review
  - 433 reviewers

Stage 2
- Stage 2 Applicants
  - 260 applications submitted
- Stage 2 Review
  - 173 reviewers

Stage 3
- Final Assessment Committee meeting was held on June 13th and 14th, 2016.
- Final Assessment Committee meeting was held on June 13th and 14th, 2016.
- Stage 3 Applicants
  - 96 applications discussed
- Stage 3 Review
  - 16 virtual chairs, 1 Chair, and 1 Scientific Officer

120 Foundation Grants awarded
2016-2017 Foundation Grant Competition

Stage 1
- Stage 1 Applicants
  ➢ 600 applications submitted
- Stage 1 Review
  ➢ 311 reviewers

Stage 2
- Stage 2 Applicants
  ➢ TBD
- Stage 2 Review
  ➢ TBD

Stage 3
- Final assessment stage review
  ➢ June-July 2017

Anticipated Notice of Decision: August 3rd, 2017
Overall, women do very well in CIHR grant competitions; however, gender inequities have been identified.

We have already taken action to implement solutions, which includes the implementation of mandatory training for all CIHR reviewers on both unconscious bias and gender bias.

We are monitoring the 2016-2017 Foundation Grant competition results and, if necessary, we will equalize the number of male and female applications moving forward to stage 2.
2016-2017 Foundation Grant Competition Review Process

Adjudication Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>O++</td>
<td>For this sub-criterion, the application excels in most or all relevant aspects. Any short-comings are minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>E++</td>
<td>For this sub-criterion, the application excels in many relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Certain improvements are possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>For this sub-criterion, the application excels in some relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Some improvements are necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>For this sub-criterion, the application broadly addresses all relevant aspects. Major revisions are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>For this sub-criterion, the application fails to provide convincing information and/or has serious inherent flaws or gaps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Timeline for the 2016-2017 Foundation Grant Competition

## Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration Deadline</td>
<td>September 13, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Deadline – Stage 1</td>
<td>October 13, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Notice of Decision – Stage 1</td>
<td>February 2, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Deadline – Stage 2</td>
<td>March 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Notice of Decision – Final Assessment Stage</td>
<td>August 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Start Date</td>
<td>July 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Grant Overview

- The Project Grant competitions are about funding ideas with the greatest potential for important advances in health.

- Project Grant competitions are meant to ensure that there are opportunities for applicants from all disciplines to bring forward proposals from all areas of health research or knowledge translation.

- The focus is on creativity, originality and potential Impact.

Budget 2016 has provided CIHR with an additional $30 million per year.

This new investment from Budget 2016 will be entirely dedicated to the ongoing and future Project Grant competitions with a focus on early career investigators.
Spring 2016 Project Grant Competition

Stage 1
- Stage 1 Applicants
  - 3818 eligible applications submitted
- Stage 1 Review
  - 1664 reviewers

Stage 2
- Final Assessment Committee meeting held on July 7-8, 2016
- Stage 2 Applicants
  - 100 applications considered by committee
- Stage 2 Committee Membership
  - 1 Chair, 1 Scientific Officer and 31 Members

491 Project Grants awarded
Fall 2016 Project Grant Competition

Stage 1
- **Stage 1 Applicants**
  - Close to 2900 eligible applications submitted
- **Stage 1 Review**
  - January-February 2017

Stage 2
- Final Assessment Panel meetings in April 2017
- **Stage 2 Applicants**
  - 40% of Stage 1 applications
- **Stage 2 Panel Memberships**
  - Chairs, Scientific Officers and a subset of Stage 1 reviewers

Anticipated Notice of Decision: May 15, 2017
Indigenous Health Research

Complementary iterative peer review process guided by Indigenous Health Research Reference Group

Applications must demonstrate
- TCPS2 - Chapter 9 Research involving the First Nations, Inuit and Métis Peoples of Canada; and
- Indigenous partnering community/organizational ethical guidelines

Purpose of the iterative peer review process is to
- ensure that applications are assessed by reviewers with the appropriate expertise and that funding of these types of research is at an appropriate level
- support mentorship
Fall 2016 Project Grant Competition Review Process

Dynamic Clustering of Applications – Application-Focused Review

Built using the following parameters:

- Applicant self-declared primary Area of Science.
- Control size of cluster to manage workload and ensure that sufficient proportion of applications move to Stage 2 (i.e., 60-100 applications).
- Increased or decreased cluster size using applicant self-declared secondary Area of Science and Methods.
- Competition Chairs have option to recruit more than one Scientific Officer per cluster if nature of cluster requires.
Assignment of Applications to Reviewers

- Assignments will build on conflict and ability to review (CAR) responses from reviewers.
- Assignments will be validated by Competition Chairs and CIHR staff.
- The assignment optimization tool will maximize the assignment of reviewers to applications within a given cluster.
- Each application will be assigned to 4 reviewers and each reviewer will be assigned 8 to 12 applications.
- Reviewers who have submitted an application will not be assigned to review applications in the same cluster as their own application.
Stage 1 review will assess the concept and feasibility of the projects:

- **Concept**
  - Significance and Impact of the Research (25%)

- **Feasibility**
  - Approaches and Methods (50%)
  - Expertise, Experience and Resources (25%)

Ratings are to assist with ranking – final rankings will be used for decisions on success at Stage 1.

The review will be conducted remotely through ResearchNet.
Approximately 40% of applications will move to Stage 2 discussions:

• Applications ranked in top 30% across clusters and within clusters.

• The remaining portion (approximately 10%) will include applications such as those that have large scoring discrepancies, were specifically flagged by Competition Chairs, or were highly ranked within their clusters.
Fall 2016 Project Grant Competition Review Process

Adjudication Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>For this sub-criterion, the application excels in most or all relevant aspects. Any short-comings are minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>80-90</td>
<td>For this sub-criterion, the application excels in many relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Certain improvements are possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>For this sub-criterion, the application excels in some relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Improvements are necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>For this sub-criterion, the application broadly addresses relevant aspects. Major revisions are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0-39</td>
<td>For this sub-criterion, the application fails to provide convincing information and/or has serious inherent flaws or gaps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Timeline for the Project Grant: 2016-2017 Competition

#### Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration Deadline</td>
<td>September 20, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Deadline</td>
<td>October 20, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Notice of Decision</td>
<td>May 15, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Start Date</td>
<td>April 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College of Reviewers
College of Reviewers Chairs

Appointments began on July 1, 2016 and the inaugural meeting was in October 2016

Executive Chair
Paul Kubes
University of Calgary

Eric Brown
McMaster University

Max S. Cynader
University of British Columbia

Jayne Danska
Hospital for Sick Children

Sherry L. Dupuis
University of Waterloo

Richard Glazier
Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences

Phillipe Gros
McGill University

Peter Jones
University of Manitoba

Josée Lavoie
University of Manitoba

Dawn Martin Hill
McMaster University

Patrick McGrath
IWK Health Centre

Barbara Morrongiello
University of Guelph

Steven Narod
Women’s College Research Institute

Morag Park
McGill University

Louise Potvin
Université de Montréal

Jane Rylett
Western University

David Thomas
McGill University
Four Functions

The College is structured around 4 main functions

1. Recruitment
2. Learning & Mentoring
3. Performance Management & Quality Assurance
4. Membership Management, Incentives & Recognition

ACTIVITIES WILL BE BASED ON AN EVIDENCE-INFORMED APPROACH
International Peer Review
Expert Panel
International Peer Review Expert Panel

- In September 2016, CIHR launched an international Peer Review Expert Panel to examine the design and adjudication processes of CIHR’s investigator-initiated programs.

- Panel members will convene in Ottawa in January 2017 for a two-day series of meetings with key stakeholders and scientific community representatives.

- The Panel’s final report will be made public by the spring 2017.

- Their recommendations are expected to help inform refinements to the investigator-initiated programs moving forward.

Chair
Professor Sir Peter Gluckman

Professor Jonathan Grant
Chief Science Advisor to the Prime Minister of New Zealand

Dr. Trish Groves
Professor Mats Ulfendahl

The British Medical Journal (BMJ)
Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

Dr. Michael Lauer
Professor Mark Ferguson

National Institutes of Health (NIH)
Science Foundation Ireland and Government of Ireland

Professor Dame Anne Glover
External Affairs and University of Aberdeen
CIHR Contact Centre
CIHR Contact Centre

Funding Support

It is the central point of contact for CIHR.

It provides consistent, coordinated and integrated service delivery by centrally managing inquiries.

Through the Contact Centre, CIHR continues to:

• Strengthen its relationships with key stakeholders; and
• Improve information sharing.
CIHR Contact Centre

Funding Support

Inquiry Management

The CIHR Contact Centre is responsible for responding to all research funding inquiries including administrative processes and technical support.

This includes:

- Application Processing
- Post-Award Administration
- Technical Support

Monday to Friday
7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. ET and until 8 p.m. ET on deadline days

support@cihr-irsc.gc.ca
Telephone: 613-954-1968
Toll Free: 1-888-603-4178
Thank you