THE WHY'S AND WHEREFORE'S OF SUBMITTING TO CIHR

Leslie Copp, Manager GGRC (Health research)

Overview

- CIHR FAQ's & Tidbits
- What's New at CIHR
  - Changes in review committees
  - Electronic submission
  - RFA's and Priority Announcements
- Biomedical review – take home messages
- UW FAQ's & Tidbits & Resources
- UW Incentive Program for Research

Why CIHR?

- $979 total budget in 0809
  - 75% to grants & awards (70:30 open:strategic)
  - 20% to ‘flow through’ (CRC, NCE & CECR)
- Average grant size (Mar 09) $136,760
- Between 400-450 full term grants awarded each open competition, with additional priority and bridge (1 year) funding
- Strategic initiatives & various grant types

Not so much ‘why’, but you should know….

- Budgets cut by 11% in last competition (CIHR committed to reducing this further)
- Each review committee given the SAME success rate
- New submissions, renewals, resubmissions, new investigators all on the same playing field
- Equipment currently not eligible in budgets (but you can buy it if you receive a grant)

What's new at CIHR?

- Revamped committee names and mandates http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/4657.html
- SSHRC funding much fewer areas of health research – now covered by CIHR (but no new money)
  - Humanities, Law, Ethics & Society in Health (HLE)
  - Psychosocial, Sociocultural & Behavioural Determinants of Health (PB1)
  - Social & Developmental Aspects of Children's & Youth's Health (CHI)
  - Social Dimensions in Aging (SDA)
  - Knowledge Translation Research (KTR)
  - Gender, Sex & Health (GSH)
  - Health Policy & Systems Management Research (HPM)

What's newer at CIHR?

- Revised and revamped Grants & Awards Guide (www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/805.html)
- Policy changes:
  - Eligibility
  - Signature requirements
  - End of grant reports
  - International collaborations
  - Knowledge user community
  - Access to research outputs (PMC Canada)

More of what's new at CIHR

- Electronic submission and approval
  - Registration all electronic, no signatures required
  - For application stage, signature pages are to be scanned and uploaded on ResearchNet – hard copies held at UW
  - PI signature not required – electronic submission verifies PI approval
  - More controls on page limits, completion, etc.
  - Simpler CV process
  - Internal deadline – UW doesn't set one

Strategic funding at CIHR

- RFAs
  - Variety of types (eg. catalyst, team, & operating grants, training & salary awards, proof of principle)
  - Variable deadlines, guidelines, eligibility, funding support
- Priority announcements
  - Strategic money through open competitions
  - Simple to access: ID in drop down lists and fill in relevance form (a couple of paragraphs and a check list)

From a reviewer's perspective

- Novelty – how much will it advance the field?
- Impact – potential to improve the health of Canadians?
- Feasibility
  - Does the team have the know-how?
  - Does the team have the tools/assays/models?
  - ***Is there preliminary work/pilot data supporting the hypotheses?***
  - Is the research plan sound?

From a reviewer's perspective

- First thing mentioned – the PI
  - Productivity
  - Impact of journals
  - Other support
- If a new PI
  - Independence from previous supervisor
  - Training
  - Institutional support
  - Productivity
- Then the team (if applicable)

More from a reviewer's perspective

- Clearly state objectives and hypotheses
- Clearly link experiments with objectives and explicitly state expected outcomes
- CIHR likes considerable detail in methods
- Include relevant publications (up to five)
- Make use of tables, figures and charts (unlimited space for these)
- If objectives too 'loose' – leave them out
- Use headings and formatting to help tell the story

A bit about budgets

- Reviewers are ‘in the field’ – they will know if your budget is in the ballpark or too greedy
- Justify, justify, justify
- Named personnel tend to be safe in a budget
- Use CIHR rates for trainees
- NOTE – UW has graduate research studentships for trainees, so NO benefits associated with these

Interpreting SO notes

- ‘very good’ = 3.5-3.9 and ‘excellent’ = 4.0-4.4
- ‘encourage to re-apply’ not always explicit
- Generally summarize the critical issues
- If they don’t give you any major issues, but you score and rank low = lack of enthusiasm
- ‘dense’ / ‘difficult to read’ – get some help/mentorship before reapplying
- There is no ‘three-strikes-you’re-out’ rule, but…

UW resources

- I will provide review for impact, readability, adherence to guidelines, budget, proof-reading (submit word doc's by email)
- Library of successful applications
- Handouts from new investigator forum
- Recommended salary rates document

UW procedure for CIHR grant submission

- Give Leslie heads-up about intention to apply
- Submit at least the budget and justification (via email) for review before getting signatures
- Signed OR coversheet (with UW signatures) & routing slip with signed CIHR signature pages (with all applicant and other institutional signatures) must be submitted to OR (Leslie) BEFORE the application will be approved

UW Research Incentive Funding

- If you submit to CIHR:
  - Rate above 3.5
  - Ranked in the top third (ie. 33 or less percentile)
  - But unfunded
- You may receive $8,000 incentive funding from UW
  - Provide a copy of the results & reviews
  - Submit a one-pager with plans
  - Commit to re-submitting proposal within 2 years

Contact

Leslie Copp, ext 36040, lcopp@uwaterloo.ca

Dates to remember:

- Registration deadline for open competition is August 17
- Full application deadline is September 15