



CIHR Townhall

January 2015

Dr. Jane E. Aubin
Canadian Institutes of Health Research

The objectives of today's presentation are to:

- Introduce CIHR's new Strategic Plan – Health Research Roadmap II - Capturing innovation for better health and health care
- Address some of the rumours about CIHR's budget and changes to the Institutes
- Provide an update on the first Foundation Scheme Pilot – including some of the preliminary survey results
- Provide an update on the launch of the Project Scheme and the College of Reviewers



Health Research Roadmap II - Capturing innovation for better health and health care

What is the link between Roadmap I and Roadmap II?



- *Health Research Roadmap II* (2014) is an updated version of CIHR's previous strategic plan (2009-2013).
- It strikes a balance between **completing** the transformation we set to achieve in *Roadmap* (2009), and **aligning** to the future.



Completing Roadmap


A number of current *Roadmap* initiatives and activities will **continue** to be an important part of *Roadmap II*.

Aligning to the Future

There will also be **new** initiatives and activities that CIHR must embrace to stay relevant and aligned to the future.

What are CIHR's strategic directions for the next five years?

Roadmap II's strategic directions will guide efforts and investments to advance knowledge and capture innovation for better health and health care.



Strategic Direction #1

Promoting excellence, creativity and breadth in health research and knowledge translation



- Supporting **investigator-initiated** ideas and research, from discovery to application.
- Decreasing researcher burden with the implementation of the **Foundation and Project Open funding schemes**.
- Improving the effectiveness, consistency, reliability, fairness and sustainability of peer review decisions through changes to **peer review processes**.
- Ensuring the sustainability of the health research enterprise through the development of a national vision to position **trainees** for success in both academic and non-academic careers.

CIHR is committed to supporting investigator-initiated research.

Strategic Direction #2

Mobilizing health research for transformation and impact



- Maximizing the health, social and economic **impact** of research through targeted and partnered investments.
- Enabling **multidisciplinary** research to address complex research questions.
- **Focusing** critical health issues championed by Canadians.
- Forging strategic alliances with new health and non-health **partners**.

Success in health innovation will be achieved through strategic alliances.

What are the new refreshed priorities for Priority-Driven Research?

Discussions with researchers, partners and other stakeholders have informed a refreshed set of priorities.

Enhanced patient experiences and outcomes through health innovation

- Accelerating the discovery, development, evaluation and integration of health innovations into practice so that patients can receive the right treatments at the right time.

Health and wellness for Aboriginal peoples

- Supporting the health and wellness goals of Aboriginal peoples through shared research leadership and the establishment of culturally-sensitive policies and interventions.

A healthier future through preventive action

- A proactive approach to understanding and addressing the causes of ill health, and supporting physical and mental wellness at the individual, population and system levels.

Improved quality of life for persons living with chronic conditions

- Understanding multiple, co-existing chronic conditions and supporting integrated solutions that enable Canadians to continue to participate actively in society.




CIHR IRSC

CIHR's Budget and Changes to the Institutes

Was CIHR's budget cut by 50%?

CIHR Budget 2014-15 - \$1,018.1M



- Operating Support
- Training & Career Support
- Horizontal Health Research Initiatives
- Institute-Driven Initiatives
- Operating Budget & EBP


Recent government investments have focused on Tri-Council programs for training and horizontal initiatives.



* Anticipated budget, including 2014-15 Supplementary Estimates C and adjustments to be provided by Treasury Board.

How much of CIHR's budget is allocated to Investigator-Initiated Operating Grants?

- In 2012, CIHR's Governing Council committed to increasing the funding envelope for the **Investigator-Initiated programs by \$10M a year** cumulatively for five years, beginning in 2014.



Will researchers be forced to find their own partners in order to access CIHR funding?

- Researchers **will not** be forced to find their own partners for the Foundation Scheme, the Project Scheme, or for the awards programs.
- Leverage is required for many priority-driven initiatives and this leverage will sometimes come from CIHR-Institute partners and sometimes from applicant partners.

Why is CIHR making changes to the Institutes?

- Governing Council has now completed the Institutes Model Review as mandated in the *CIHR Act*, and as recommended by the 2011 International Review Panel.
- This review has resulted in two key changes:
 1. **Restructuring the Institute Advisory Boards** (IABs) such that members will advise more than one Institute
 2. Enhancing effective cooperation with the Institutes by having them invest half of their budget into a **Common Research Fund**
- These changes will:
 - Provide Institutes with a broader, higher level strategic perspective
 - De-silo Institutes and provide for greater inter-Institute collaboration and more cross-disciplinary research
 - Promote linkages with national multi-disciplinary initiatives and platforms (e.g. NCEs, CECRs, Genome Centers, SPOR Support Units, etc.)
 - Continue an evolution from a researcher-driven to an impact-driven agenda

When will the changes to the Institutes be implemented?


- The changes to the Institute Advisory Boards will take time.
- Work is currently underway with the chairs of the current boards to build the new model.
- Once a new model has been identified, it will be communicated broadly.
- Until that time, the existing advisory boards will remain in place.
- The common fund, which is essentially a reallocation of resources to better support Signature Initiatives, will be established at the beginning of CIHR's next fiscal year (April 1st, 2015).



Foundation Scheme Pilot

Where are we in the transition process?

- **The transition** to the new Open Suite of Programs and peer review processes will occur over a number of years.
- Course corrections and **adjustments may be required along the way** as we learn from the results of the pilots.



What changes were made as a result of earlier pilots?

- Piloting is an essential part of the transition plan.
- As each of the pilot studies is complete, findings are made available to contribute to the body of literature on peer review and program design.
 - Fellowships – completed (www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/47940.html)
 - Knowledge Synthesis Pilot #1 – completed (report to be posted shortly); Pilot #2 – underway
 - Partnerships for Health System Improvement (PHSI) – underway
 - Knowledge to Action – underway
- Improvements have already been implemented as a result of early pilot results:
 - Development of a ***new rating scale*** for reviewers with more gradation at the higher levels.
 - Establishment of a ***virtual chair/moderator*** role to shepherd sets of applications and ensure that online discussions are being held for applications with discrepant reviews.
 - More comprehensive ***training material for applicants.***
 - More comprehensive ***training material for reviewers.***
 - Technology enhancements to ResearchNet to ***improve usability.***

Are applicants and reviewers responding to the pilot surveys?

- The response rates for the first Foundation Scheme pilot were exceptionally high

Response Rates for Foundation Scheme pilot Stage 1 (as of Jan 14, 2015)

Participant Role	Total # Invited (Survey)	Total # Responded	Survey Completion Rate
Applicant	1366	1074	78.6%
Stage 1 Reviewer	443	322	72.7%
Virtual Chair	50	40	80%


- Surveys just recently closed, and the data presented in the next few slides is **preliminary**.
- The information presented in the following slides should therefore be interpreted with caution.
- The full results of the pilots will be made available once the analysis is complete.

How many reviewers participated in Stage 1 of the Foundation Scheme?


- In Stage 1, 1366 applications were reviewed by **443 reviewers**.
- Each reviewer was assigned between 8-20 applications. The average was 15 applications. Almost all applications were reviewed by 5 reviewers.
- As the tool to match reviewers to applications was not in place for this pilot, a labour intensive manual process was used for assignment.
- For future pilots, a matching solution will be put in place.
- This will assist CIHR staff and the virtual chairs/moderators with the assignment of reviewers to applications using “concept matching” functionality.

Who was successful in Stage 1 of the Foundation Scheme?

- After analyzing the results of the competition and the available budget, CIHR has **invited 467 (34%)** applicants to submit a Stage 2 application.
- At this point in the process, it is anticipated that between 150-210 applications will be funded in the first pilot.




What was the pillar distribution for Stage 1 of the Foundation Scheme?



How did new/early career investigators do in Stage 1 of the Foundation Scheme?

- The first Foundation Scheme competition received more applications from new/early career investigators than originally expected (40.92% of applications).
- Peer reviewers expressed some concern about their ability to rank very new investigators.
- Despite these challenges, almost **20% of all applications** (87 of the 467) that were brought forward to Stage 2 were submitted by new/early career investigators.
- This is comparable to what is typically seen in the OOGP (~15%).
- CIHR has committed to ensuring that a minimum of 15% of the funded Foundation grants at the end of the process will be awarded to new/early career investigators.


Distribution of Applications submitted by New/Early Career Investigators by Pillar



How did mid-career investigators do in Stage 1 of the Foundation Scheme?

- CIHR does not currently have a definition for “mid-career investigator”.
- The system does track:
 1. Applicants who have been independent researchers for 5 – 10 years (61 – 120 months)
 2. Applicants who indicated their current academic position to be “Associate Professor”

Distribution of Applications Submitted



** There is overlap between the individuals included in the “5 -10 years as an Independent Investigator” and the “Associate Professor” categories in the figure above.*

Is the structured application/review working?

Applicants


* The data presented is preliminary data gathered from survey respondents who participated in Stage 1 of the first Foundation Scheme live pilot, and further analysis is required.

Thoughts regarding the structured application format (i.e. having one section for each adjudication criterion)

The Structured Application Format is Easy to Work With


The Structured Application Format is Intuitive

Applicants are Satisfied with the Structured Application Process



Reviewers


The structured application format was helpful in my review process



Compared to the last time reviewers reviewed applications for CIHR (i.e. completed a non-structured review), completing a structured review:

Made it Easier to Review

Was a Better way to Provide Feedback to Applicants




Are reviewers able to assess the criteria across all career stages?

- Reviewers were provided with interpretation guidelines for each of the adjudication criteria and then asked to apply these based on career stage (www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/48193.html):
 - Leadership
 - Significance of Contributions
 - Productivity
 - Vision/Program Direction
- Feedback from reviewers has indicated that it was difficult to apply the adjudication criteria across career stages.
 - Reviewers found the Leadership criterion to be particularly difficult to apply.
- CIHR will look at providing additional guidance to reviewers in the next pilot.


Are reviewers participating in online discussions?

* The data presented is preliminary data gathered from survey respondents who participated in Stage 1 of the first Foundation Scheme live pilot, and further analysis is required.

Did reviewers participate in online discussions?



Reviewer thoughts regarding the online discussion:




Is applicant and reviewer burden starting to decrease?

* The data presented is preliminary data gathered from survey respondents who participated in Stage 1 of the first Foundation Scheme live pilot, and further analysis is required.


Applicants:

- Compared to the last time you submitted an application to CIHR, completing the structured application took, on average:



Reviewers:

- Compared to the last time you reviewed for a CIHR competition, the workload assigned to you was:




Is the support material for reviewers effective?

* The data presented is preliminary data gathered from survey respondents who participated in Stage 1 of the first Foundation Scheme live pilot, and further analysis is required.

Reviewers

Documents were used

Documents were useful



I am preparing my Stage 2 application, what should I consider in my budget request?

- You are required to establish a budget baseline based on your funding history. This information will be considered as part of the evaluation of your Foundation Scheme budget request.
- If your budget request exceeds the baseline amount, a justification for the additional amount requested must be provided. This will be assessed by peer reviewers.
- To establish this baseline:
 - Provide an overview of your past relevant funding history from CIHR (applicants currently holding CIHR funding); or,
 - Provide an overview of other funding that you currently hold (or have held) in the past 7 years (applicants who have never held CIHR funding).
- Ultimately, the onus is on the applicant to justify to their peers that the amount they are requesting is appropriate to support their proposed program.
- For complete budget instructions, please refer to the Stage 2 Application Instructions available on the CIHR website (<http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/48824.html>).

When will funding decisions be made for the 2014 Foundation Scheme?

- Decisions for the first Foundation pilot will occur in July 2015.
- The competition timelines for the 2014 Foundation Scheme "live pilot" are as follows:

Registration Deadline	June 23, 2014
Stage 1 Application Deadline	September 15, 2014
Anticipated Stage 1 Notice of Decision	December 1, 2014
Stage 2 Application Deadline	February 5, 2015
Anticipated Stage 2 Notice of Decision	May 15, 2015
Anticipated Stage 3 Notice of Decision	July 15, 2015
Funding Start Date	July 1, 2015

How will the budget be shared between Foundation Scheme and the Transitional OOGP?

- The combined budget available for the Transitional OOGP and the 2014 Foundation Scheme "Live Pilot" is approximately \$500M.
- The exact allocation of funds between the two programs will be determined based on application pressure and requested budgets.
- CIHR estimates that it will fund approximately 450-600 Transitional OOGP grants and between 150-210 Foundation grants.
- Approximately 3330 applicants have registered for the Transitional OOGP competition
- The previous OOGP competition received 3270 registrations.



CIHR IRSC

Project Scheme

When is the Project Scheme being launched?

- The funding opportunity for the 2016 Project Scheme “live pilot” competition will be posted before March 2015 to provide the community with time to prepare.
- Key dates include:

Registration Deadline	January 15, 2016
Stage 1 Application Deadline	March 1, 2016
Anticipated Stage 1 Notice of Decision	May 16, 2016
Anticipated Notice of Decision	July 4, 2016
Funding Start Date	July 1, 2016

The Project Scheme is designed to capture ideas with the greatest potential for important advances.

What is the plan for integrating existing legacy open programs?

- As part of the implementation of the Reforms, a number of existing open programs will be integrated.
- CIHR has been piloting the new Project Scheme design elements in many of these programs to ensure applicability of the new design.
- As the pilot results have been positive, these programs will be integrated into the new open funding schemes. The application deadlines for the final competition for each of these programs are:

Legacy Open Program	Competition Launch	Application Deadline
Open Operating Grants Program	November 2013	March 2015
Partnerships for Health System Improvement	June 2015	October 2015
Knowledge Synthesis	June 2015	December 2015
Knowledge to Action	June 2015	October 2015
Proof-of-Principle (I and II)	June 2015	September 2015
Industry-Partnered Collaborative Research Program	June 2015	September 2015
New Investigator Salary Awards	July 2015	December 2015

- To ensure a smooth transition, **minimum thresholds** will be established for partnered/integrated KT applications in the Project Scheme and for new/early career investigators in the Foundation Scheme.




CIHR IRSC

College of Reviewers

When will recruitment for the College begin?

- CIHR will begin to enroll College members in the coming months, using a phased-in approach.
- The first waves will be CIHR's current and recently active reviewers.
- Reviewers will be asked to agree to a set of terms and conditions for the College and will be asked to validate a reviewer profile.
- In parallel, a number of targeted recruitment approaches will be developed to address areas where there are gaps in reviewer expertise.
- If you are interesting in becoming a member of the College of Reviewers please contact the research office at your institution.
- CIHR will be coordinating with institutions to identify potential College members.



Who is helping CIHR build the College?

- An Interim Advisory Group has been established to:
 - Serve as an advisory body to refine the College design
 - Act as champions for the College and its credibility
 - Contribute to defining the structure for the College of Reviewers
 - Provide input and advice into the key components, as well as short-term targets of the College
- Senior leaders will also be recruited from various research communities to act as **expertise cluster leads** in the College. An expression of interest process will be launched in February 2015.
- Key partners are also being engaged as we develop key elements of the College.

College Advisory Group Members:

- Gerry Wright, McMaster University (Chair)
- Brett Finlay, University of British Columbia (previous Chair – on sabbatical)
- Ivy Bourgeault, University of Ottawa
- Andreas Laupacis, St. Michael's Hospital
- Martin Schechter, University of British Columbia

