New CAN-ACN CIHR reforms questionnaire results

Do you currently hold a CIHR grant?

- Yes: 68%
- No: 32%

How many years have you been a principal investigator?

- More than 10 years: 64%
- 6-10 years: 21%
- 0-5 years: 15%
Changes to the Funding system with the introduction of Foundation and Project Schemes

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

- 68% I don’t have any concerns, the reform is a positive step forward
- 11% I have few small concerns, but in general I support the reforms.
- 15% I have significant concerns, but I believe they will be addressed as the transition moves ahead.
- 3% I have serious concerns about the proposed reforms, they are fundamentally flawed.
- 2% I support the new Foundation/Project grant scheme only if significantly more funding were obtained from the federal government for the new scheme.
- 1% The reforms will not change anything.

Have you expressed your opinion to CIHR during consultation?

- 72% yes
- 28% no
What do you think would be the appropriate Foundation/Project funding ratio?

- 10% Foundation, 90% Projects: 0%
- 25% Foundation, 75% Projects: 7%
- 50% Foundation, 50% Projects: 45%
- 75% Foundation, 25% Projects: 48%
- 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: 10%
- Lower: 28%
- Much lower: 46%
- Too early to tell: 10%
In the last three years how did your funding status change

- 47% I have less research support from CIHR
- 35% I have more support from CIHR
- 18% No change

---

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

What was your impression of the new review criteria?

- 83% The new review criteria do not allow the proper evaluation of a research grant.
- 3% The new criteria capture well all the important elements of a research grant.
- 14% In general, review criteria are well thought out, only few small changes are required.
Were the questions you were asked to address in the proposal as an applicant clear?

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

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

- Yes: 60%
- No: 23%
- I was not a reviewer: 17%
- I did not apply: 0%
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. (14%)
- The review process lacked few experts but in general if was satisfactory (2%)
- The review process lacked the necessary level of expertise, it is fundamentally flawed. (3%)
- The review process has significant issues, but they can be corrected. (81%)

Were the feedbacks/comments you received helpful?

- Yes (23%)
- No (77%)
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)

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

- No, the current system is more efficient
- Does not matter, the results are similar.
- Yes, face-to-face review is better.
**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.
- Few problems, but it is expected from a new system.
- Could be significantly improved, I am sure it will be corrected for the next round.
- It was unsatisfactory as compared to the previous review system, and cannot be sufficiently improved