

Results of the CAN-ACN CIHR reforms survey, July -August 2016

Do you currently hold a CIHR grant

Yes	68.3%
No	31.7%

How many years have you been a principal investigator?

0-5 years	15%
6-10 years	21%
More than 10 years	64%

Changes to the Funding system with the introduction of Foundation and Project Schemes

What do you think about the changes to the funding structure?

I don't have any concerns, the reform is a positive step forward	2%
I have few small concerns, but in general I support the reforms.	3%
I have significant concerns, but I believe they will be addressed as the transition moves ahead.	10.9%
I have serious concerns about the proposed reforms, they are fundamentally flawed.	68.3%
I support the new Foundation/Project grant scheme only if significantly more funding were obtained from the federal government for the new scheme.	14.9%
The reforms will not change anything.	1%

Have you expressed your opinion to CIHR during consultation?

Yes	72%
No	28%

What do you think would be the appropriate Foundation/Project funding ratio?

10% Foundation, 90% Projects	44.9%
25% Foundation, 75% Projects	48%
50% Foundation, 50% Projects	7.1%
75% Foundation, 25% Projects	0
90% Foundation, 10% Projects	0

Do you believe that your chances of receiving sufficient, stable funding under the new Foundation and Project schemes are:

Much higher	1%
Higher	5%
About the same	9.9%
Lower	27.7%
Much lower	46.5%
Too early to tell	9.9%

In the last three years how did your funding status change

No change	47.5%
I have less research support from CIHR	17.8%
I have more support from CIHR	34.7%

Changes to the peer-review system - Part A - Review criteria

What was your impression of the new review criteria?

The new criteria capture well all the important elements of a research grant.	3%
In general, review criteria are well thought out, only few small changes are required.	13.9%
The new review criteria do not allow the proper evaluation of a research grant.	83.2%

Were the questions you were asked to address in the proposal as an applicant clear?

Yes	7%
Mostly clear, with some ambiguities	36%
No	34%
I did not apply	23%

Were the criteria used to judge the proposals clearly explained to you as a reviewer?

Yes	17%
No	23%
I was not a reviewer	60%

Changes to the peer-review system - Part B - Review process

What was your impression of the new review process? Did the level of expertise demonstrated live up to your expectations?

The review process was thorough and scores were well justified with expert opinion.	2%
The review process lacked few experts but in general it was satisfactory	3%
The review process lacked the necessary level of expertise, it is fundamentally flawed.	80.8%
The review process has significant issues, but they can be corrected.	14.1%

Were the feedbacks/comments you received helpful?

Yes	22.8%
No	77.2%

On a scale of 1-5 how much confidence do you have in the fairness of the new peer-review system?
(1=not fair, 5=very fair)

1	52%
2	29.6%
3	12.2%
4	4.1%
5	2%

Would you like to see the return to face-to-face reviews?

No, the current system is more efficient	3%
Does not matter, the results are similar.	2%
Yes, face-to face review is better.	95%

Changes to the peer-review system - Part C - Implementation of the new system

What do you think about the implementation of the new system?

It was great, no major issues.	1%
Few problems, but it is expected from a new system.	2%
Could be significantly improved, I am sure it will be corrected for the next round.	31.7%
It was unsatisfactory as compared to the previous review system, and cannot be sufficiently improved	65.3%