CIHR PROJECT GRANT
Panel Discussion

Friday, May 19th, 2023

Jessica Safarian

Advisor, Research Development
Health & Natural Sciences

Agenda

Introductory Remarks (Jessica Safarian)

    Anticipated deadlines

    2022 Program Statistics

    Opportunities to Review

    Select remarks about Review Process and Evaluation

Open Discussion

    Prof. Jennifer McGrath ** Concordia representative to CIHR

        Psychosocial, Sociocultural & Behavioral Determinants of

        Health review committee, PB1

    Prof. Uri Shalev

        Behavioural Sciences – A: Neurobiological Basis of Behavioural

        Processes

    A huge thanks to all our panelists!

Upcoming Dates: Project Grants

Applications stage	Date
Registration	Mid-August 2023
Feedback from your Advisor	10 working days prior
OoR Deadline: Upload final application to ConRAD	**5 working days prior**
Agency deadline	Mid-September 2023
Anticipated Notice of Decision	Feb 2024
Funding start date	April 1, 2024

Content Development Support vs Program Review

All grant applications are reviewed before their submission to external agencies.

CONTENT DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT	PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT + REVIEW
10 business days (or more) prior to external deadline (voluntary) **Method:** Virtually or in-person	**5 business days prior to external deadline (mandatory)** **Method**: Final and complete application through ConRAD
1. Access to sample successful applications 2. Editing of various sections for cohesiveness, formatting, content of EDI, etc. 3. Assistance with budget development (conformance with agency and institutional approved rates, travel, indirect costs, and budget justification) 4. Detailed review of drafts following the evaluation criteria and peer evaluation manual 5. Liaison with funding agency	Review of application for: 1. completeness, 2. conformance to agency guidelines 3. required signatures 4. Support/attestation letters 5. and electronic submission
Reviewer: Advisor, Research Development	**Reviewers**: Advisor, Research Development, Research Grants Unit

Concordia
UNIVERSITY

Abridged Statistics
(Fall 2022 results)

382 Grants funded   **$325M** Total investment   **93** Bridge grants

- The Project Grants: Fall 2022 competition has approved 382 research grants, plus 93 bridge grants, for a total investment of approximately $325M.
  - 2014 Applications submitted
  - 46.1% of them streamlined, while 53.9% discussed
  - 20.7% success rate (not including priority announcements or bridge funding)

- In addition, 190 priority announcement grants were funded for a total amount of $22,000,000 and 12 supplemental prizes were awarded for a total of $375,000.

- The 382 grants approved were awarded to 373 individual nominated principal investigators (9 NPIs were awarded two grants). Of the 382 grants, 103 were awarded to early career researchers, and 4 were awarded for Indigenous health research projects.

- The average grant size/duration is approximately $825,970 over 4.46 years
  - ~185,195$/year

Concordia

Submission Process
Part 1 - Registration

- You will need a ResearchNet account & CIHR PIN in ResearchNet (see instructions [here](#))

- Information collected will be used to determine which committee will review your application

- Items required:

  1. Participant information (NPA must not change) – CCVs not required

  2. Proposal information: title, abstract, details, descriptors, research summary

  3. Total requested amount (no justification – may be changed at application stage)

  4. Peer review administration information (suggested reviewers, excluded reviewers, primary & secondary committees

Submission Process
Part 2 – Full application

- Submit <u>full</u> application on ResearchNet first, *then* on ConRAD at least 5 working days prior to agency deadline

- eApproval process: Applications on ResearchNet are first received by the institution → reviewed → forwarded to CIHR

- All participants required to submit a CV (except collaborators)

- All participants except collaborators are required to complete the <u>EDI self-identification questionnaire</u>

Submission Process
Part 2 – Full application reminders

- SGBA: must demonstrate how it's incorporated into research design; methods; analysis & interpretation, and/or dissemination of findings

- Research proposal must include ALL crucial info that a reviewer needs to assess your application (pages over the 10-pg limit will be removed)

- Appendices permitted – reviewers NOT obliged to read

- Formatting guidelines: 12 pt+, black color, make sure smaller text in tables/figures legible at 100%, single-line spacing, margins at least 2cm - apply to all attachments

- Response to previous reviewers: if resubmission, you may provide response to reviewers, 2-page limit, <u>must</u> include all reviews received

Opportunities to review
Early Career Researchers

- https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/52291.html

- Applications were most recently Feb 3, 2023

- Opportunity to learn more about the review process

- NEW in past competition: participate either as mentee or ECR reviewer

- ~120 mentees, 2/committee

- ECR reviewer: must have at least one recent federally-funded peer reviewed grant as PI

- ECR reviewer: smaller load – up to 5 applications. Participate in same capacity as all reviewers

- Mentees: non-scoring attendees

Concordia
UNIVERSITY

Review Process and Evaluation

- **Peer Review Manual – Project**

- **Criterion 1. Concept**
  - Significance and Impact of the Research
    - Creativity, rationale, objectives well-defined, project likely to advance health knowledge?

- **Criterion 2. Feasibility**
  - Approaches and Methods
    - Appropriate approaches, SGBA, timelines realistic, address challenges?
  - Expertise, Experience and Resources
    - Appropriate expertise, level of engagement/commitment from applicants, environment, applicant demonstrates productivity & progress

Evaluation

- **For each application, reviewers submit:**

  - A global rating using the descriptors and definitions on the rating scale (see next slide);

  - Top (competitive) or bottom (non-competitive) group selection;

  - A summary of the research proposal (in their own words);

  - A justification of the rating by stating the strengths and weaknesses of the project based on the evaluation criteria including the strengths and weaknesses of the sex and/or gender integration in the research proposal;

  - A separate comment on how to improve the integration of sex (as a biological variable) and/or gender (as a socio-cultural factor) in the research design, methods, analysis and interpretation, and/or dissemination of findings (when applicable);

  - A budget recommendation detailing whether the requested resources are appropriate to support the project as described in the application taking into account funds already held or pending as per the CV and Summary of Progress.

Rating Scale

Descriptor	Range	Definition
Outstanding	4.5 – 4.9	The application excels in most or all relevant aspects. Any short-comings are minimal. If an application is innovative, fills an important critical gap in knowledge, has very few flaws, and the investigators are well poised to perform the research and have a very productive track record.
Excellent	4.0 – 4.4	The application excels in many relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Certain improvements are possible. If an application is very interesting, makes important advances, the team is excellent, but there are some minor limitations that need to be addressed or a clear description of impact is missing.
Good	3.5 – 3.9	The application excels in some relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Some improvements are necessary. If an application is compelling, but has limited scope or impact, and/or raised some concerns about the feasibility and/or team; or in other words, the grant has strengths, but needs work.
Fair	3.0 – 3.4	The application broadly addresses relevant aspects. Major revisions are required. If an application has merits but also has many limitations. *Will not be funded*.
Poor	0.0 – 2.9	The application fails to provide convincing information and/or has serious inherent flaws or gaps. If an application has significant flaws and is not ready to be funded. *Will not be funded*.

Advisor, Research Development Contacts

SECTOR	ADVISOR	CONTACT INFORMATION	
Business & Social Sciences	Rebekah Thompson	x 2388	rebekah.thompson@concordia.ca
Engineering & Computer Science	Lauren Segall (BCEE, CME, MIAE)	x4450	lauren.segall@concordia.ca
	Marjan Shayegan(CSSE, CIISE, CES, ECE)	x 3263	marjan.shayegan@concordia.ca
Health & Natural Sciences	Jessica Safarian	TBD	Jessica.safarian@concordia.ca

Reference Materials

- [CIHR Project Grant Program](#)
- [PG FAQs](#)
- [Registration Instructions](#)
- [PG application instructions](#)
- [Acceptable Application Formats and PDF attachments](#)
- [PG Peer review manual](#)
- [PG Peer Review Committee Mandates](#)
- [Biosketch reference guide](#)
- [CCV FAQ](#)
- [Applicant profile CV](#)
- [Tri-agency financial administration guide](#)
- [How to integrate sex and gender into research](#)
- [Sex & gender in health research](#)
- [OOR Budget-Building Tips](#)
- [Researcher's guide to financial management](#)

Open Discussion

Prof. Jennifer McGrath ** Concordia representative to CIHR

- Psychosocial, Sociocultural & Behavioral Determinants of Health review committee, PB1

Prof. Uri Shalev

- Behavioural Sciences – A: Neurobiological Basis of Behavioural Processes

Suggested discussion questions

- What are the main strengths that make great projects "stand out"?
- What are "red flags" that lead to project sinking into triage?
- Open Q&A or other priorities to discuss?

CONCORDIA.CA