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.

Roadmap II

Capturing Innovation to Produc Better Health and Health Care for Canadians

Promoting Excellence, Creativity and Breadth in Health Research and Knowledge Translation

- Feeding the innovation pipeline
- Redefining excellence in training

Mobilizing Health Research for Transformation and Impact

- Identifying research gaps and prioritizing needs
- Developing strategic initiatives
- Increasing capacity and impact

Achieving Organizational Excellence
Does CIHR still value Investigator-Initiated Research?

CIHR is committed to supporting investigator-initiated research.

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.
Mobilizing health research for transformation and impact

- Maximizing the health, social and economic impact of research through targeted and partnered investments.
- Enabling multidisciplinary research and increasing capacity to address complex research questions.
- Focusing on 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’s Budget and Changes to the Institutes
Was CIHR’s budget cut by 50%?

CIHR Budget 2014-15 - $1,018.1M

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 required to find their own partners in order to access CIHR funding?

- Researchers **will not** be required to find their own partners for the Foundation Scheme, the Project Scheme, or for the awards programs.

- Leverage is required for **some** priority-driven initiatives; the responsibility to find partners will sometimes be on CIHR and sometimes on applicants.
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.)
  - Accentuate the distinction between investigator-initiated research and priority-driven research focused on impact
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 peer 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 peer reviewers.
  - Technology enhancements to ResearchNet to improve usability.
How many peer reviewers participated in Stage 1 of the Foundation Scheme?

• In Stage 1, 1366 applications were reviewed by 443 peer reviewers.

• Each peer reviewer was assigned between 8-20 applications. The average was 15 applications. Over 98% of applications were reviewed by 5 peer reviewers.

• As the tool to match peer 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 peer 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?

Distribution of Applications by Pillar

- **Biomedical**
- **Clinical**
- **Health Systems/Services**
- **Social/Cultural/Environmental/Population Health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Percent of Applications (% of Successful Applications)</th>
<th>% of Submitted Applications</th>
<th>% of Successful Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Systems/Services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Cultural/Environmental</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historical OOGP Data (% of Successful Applications)
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.
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 6 – 10 years (61 – 120 months)
  2. Applicants who indicated their current academic position to be “Associate Professor”

Distribution of Applications Submitted

- Overall Applications
- 6-10 years as Independent Researcher
- Associate Professor

* There is overlap between the individuals included in the “6-10 years as an Independent Investigator” and the “Associate Professor” categories in the figure above.
Are applicants and peer 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Role</th>
<th>Total # Invited (Survey)</th>
<th>Total # Responded</th>
<th>Survey Completion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 Peer Reviewer</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Chair</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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.
Is the structured application/review working?

Applicants

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

Peer Reviewers

The structured application format was helpful in my review process

Compared to the last time peer 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

* 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.
Peer 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 peer reviewers has indicated that it was difficult to apply the adjudication criteria across career stages.

- Peer reviewers found the Leadership criterion to be particularly difficult to apply.

CIHR will look at providing additional guidance to peer reviewers in the next pilot.
Did peer reviewers participate in online discussions?

Peer reviewer thoughts regarding the online discussion:

- The online discussion was helpful to peer reviewers as part of the review process
- Online comments were considered by peer reviewers in the decision-making process
- Peer reviewers felt their online discussion contribution was considered by others
- The online discussion is an important component of the Stage 1 review process

* 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.
Is applicant and peer reviewer burden starting to decrease?

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

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

* 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.
Is the support material for peer 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.

Peer Reviewers

Documents were used

Documents were useful

- Foundation Scheme 2014: Funding Opportunity Details
- Eligibility criteria for the Foundation “live-pilot” competitions
- Foundation Scheme 2014 Stage 1: Application Instructions
- Foundation Scheme 2014: Application Requirements - Stage 1
- Interpretation Guidelines: Foundation Scheme Adjudication Criteria
- Peer Review Manual: Foundation Scheme
- Foundation Scheme Pilots Role Definitions
- Reforms of Open Programs and Peer Review: Foundation Scheme Live Pilots
- Reforms of Open Programs and Peer Review: Questions and Answers
- Requirements for Program Leader Foundation Scheme CV
- Foundation Scheme CV – Quick Reference Guide

Yes
No

% Respondents
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration Deadline</td>
<td>June 23, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 Application Deadline</td>
<td>September 15, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Stage 1 Notice of Decision</td>
<td>December 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 Application Deadline</td>
<td>February 5, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Stage 2 Notice of Decision</td>
<td>May 15, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Stage 3 Notice of Decision</td>
<td>July 15, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Start Date</td>
<td>July 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration Deadline</td>
<td>January 15, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Deadline</td>
<td>March 1, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Stage 1 Notice of Decision</td>
<td>May 16, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Stage 2 Notice of Decision</td>
<td>July 4, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Start Date</td>
<td>July 1, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 anticipated application deadlines for the final competition for each of these programs are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legacy Open Program</th>
<th>Competition Launch</th>
<th>Anticipated Application Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Operating Grants Program</td>
<td>November 2013</td>
<td>March 2015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships for Health System Improvement</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Synthesis</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge to Action</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-Partnered Collaborative Research Program</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Investigator Salary Awards</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Actual

- 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.
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 peer reviewers.

• Peer reviewers will be asked to agree to a set of terms and conditions for the College and will be asked to validate a peer reviewer profile.

• In parallel, a number of targeted recruitment approaches will be developed to address areas where there are gaps in peer 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