

GENERIC CLEARANCE UNDER OMB# 0925-0627
EXP. DATE: 2/28/2014

Enhancing Peer Review Initiative Advisory Council Survey



Sponsored by:

National Institutes of Health

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number of this information collection is 0925-0627. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 15 minutes per survey, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: NIH, Project Clearance Branch, 6705 Rockledge Drive, MSC 7974, Bethesda, MD 20892-7974 Attn: PRA (0925-0474). If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, contact RTI International, 3040 Cornwallis Road, PO Box 12194, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194. 1-800-334-8561 Attn: RTI Project # 0212255.

[Next Page >>](#)



National Institutes of Health
(NIH)
9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20892



Department of Health
and Human Services



INTRODUCTION

This survey of NIH Advisory Council/Board members is to help examine NIH's Enhancing Peer Review Initiative (<http://enhancing-peer-review.nih.gov>). The objectives of the initiative are to engage the best reviewers, improve the quality and transparency of peer review, and ensure balanced and fair reviews. This is the second "point in time" survey to gather members' opinions about the peer review process. This information will be useful in assessing the changes introduced by the Enhancing Peer Review Initiative and may be used to further improve the peer review process.

We are interested in the opinions of Advisory Council/Board members with different levels of experience with the NIH grants system. Even if you have limited experience reviewing and/or submitting NIH grant applications, your opinions are very important to us.

The survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. You can stop at any point and continue at another time. There are no right or wrong answers, so please give the answer that best describes your opinion. While we would like you to answer all the questions in this survey, you may skip any questions that you do not wish to answer.

Your participation is entirely voluntary. If you choose to complete the survey, your responses will remain anonymous. Your responses will not be linked to your name and will not be made known to NIH staff or grant applicants. They will not be used to assess the performance of individual NIH Institutes, Centers, or Scientific Review Groups. Aggregate responses will be used to guide NIH management in refining enhancements to the peer review process.

Your participation is greatly appreciated.

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page >>](#)



National Institutes of Health
(NIH)
9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20892



Department of Health
and Human Services





SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR EXPERIENCE AS AN ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBER

1. For this first question we are interested in the number of years you have served as a chartered Council/Board member, but not time spent as a temporary member for a single meeting or working group. How many total years have you served as a chartered member of one or more NIH National Advisory Councils/ Boards? (Total membership does not have to be continuous.)

- less than 1 year
- at least 1 year but less than 3 years
- at least 3 years but less than 5 years
- at least 5 years but less than 10 years
- 10 or more years
- not sure

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page >>](#)





2. Was the orientation you received from NIH to the shortened, realigned applications helpful to carrying out your Advisory Council/Board duties?

- Yes, it was helpful
- No, it was not helpful
- It made no difference
- I did not receive an orientation

3. Please indicate below whether you reviewed the content of summary statements and/or grant applications as part of your Advisory Council deliberations during the most recent two council rounds. If you did not review these materials during the two most recent rounds, then please select "neither of these".

Select all that apply

- I reviewed the content of summary statements during the two most recent council rounds
- I reviewed the content of grant applications during the two most recent council rounds.
- Neither of these

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page>>](#)





SECTION B: IMPACT OF THE PEER REVIEW ENHANCEMENTS ON NIH ADVISORY COUNCIL/BOARD ACTIVITIES

Think about the summary statements you have reviewed in your role as an Advisory Council/Board member during the most recent two council rounds.

If you did not use summary statements as described in any of the following Advisory Council/Board activities during at least one of the most recent two council rounds, please select Not Applicable.

In general, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of following statements?

4. The overall impact/priority score appears consistent with the information in the Resume and Summary of Discussion section.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page>>](#)



5. The information contained in summary statement resumes is helpful for making Advisory Council recommendations.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

6. The information contained in the critiques is helpful for making Advisory Council recommendations.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page >>](#)



National Institutes of Health
(NIH)
9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20892



Department of Health
and Human Services



Please answer the following questions about the summary statements you have reviewed in your role as an Advisory Council/Board member during the most recent two council rounds.

7. The bulleted comments reflect complete, well-composed thoughts.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page >>](#)



National Institutes of Health
(NIH)
9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20892



Department of Health
and Human Services





8. The bulleted comments provided with the individual review criteria are helpful to me in understanding the scientific merit of each of the following review criteria.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
a. Significance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Investigator	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Innovation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Approach	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Environment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page >>](#)



National Institutes of Health
(NIH)
9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20892



Department of Health
and Human Services



9. Individual criterion scores are consistent with the strengths and weaknesses described in the critiques.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

10. The information contained in the summary statements is useful for evaluating applications from foreign institutions.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page>>](#)



National Institutes of Health
(NIH)
9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20892



Department of Health
and Human Services





Please answer the following questions about the summary statements you have reviewed in your role as an Advisory Council member during the most recent two council rounds.

11. The information contained in the critiques is useful for making recommendations about appeals based on errors of fact.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

12. The information contained in the summary statements is useful for making recommendations about multi-component projects.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page >>](#)





13. The narrative Overall Impact statement in critiques helped me to understand how the five scored review criteria contributed to the overall impact score assigned to applications.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

14. During the most recent two council rounds, the number of ties among the overall impact/priority scores and percentile rankings for applications has NOT been a problem in making Advisory Council/Board recommendations.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page >>](#)





SECTION C: OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE ENHANCING PEER REVIEW INITIATIVE

15. Overall, which peer review system do you prefer - the new system (including ALL changes made to date from the **Enhancing Peer Review Initiative**) or the old system (without ANY of the changes from the **Enhancing Peer Review Initiative**)?

- New System
- Old System
- No preference between the new or the old systems
- Not applicable – no experience with old system

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page>>](#)





16. How fair was the peer review process at NIH in the two most recent council rounds?

- Very fair
- Somewhat fair
- Neither fair nor unfair
- Somewhat unfair
- Very unfair

17. How satisfied were you with the peer review process at NIH in the two most recent council rounds?

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page >>](#)





SECTION D: QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND AND PRIOR EXPERIENCE WITH NIH'S EXTRAMURAL PROGRAMS

18. For approximately how many NIH study section or meetings and Special Emphasis Panels have you served as a reviewer during your lifetime altogether?

- Fewer than 3 times
- 3 - 6 times
- 7 - 15 times
- 16 times or greater
- Not Sure

19. Have you ever applied for an NIH grant as a PI, as one of multiple PDs/Pis, or as a candidate for an individual fellowship or career award?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page >>](#)





20. In total, for how many years have you received NIH funding as a PI, one of multiple PDs/PIs, or as a candidate for an individual fellowship or career award (funding does not have to be continuous)?

- Less than 1 year
- at least 1 year but less than 5 years
- at least 5 years but less than 10 years
- at least 10 years but less than 15 years
- at least 15 years but less than 20 years
- 20 or more years

21. What type of organization do you work for?

Select all that apply.

- Institution of higher education (including a university foundation)
- Hospital/medical center (including teaching hospitals)
- Independent research foundation or other non-profit institution
- Private sector/for-profit organization (including small businesses)
- Federal, state, or local government agency
- Other

Specify (150 chars):

[<< Previous Page](#)

[Next Page >>](#)





22. In the space below, please provide any additional comments you have about changes to the Enhancing Peer Review that were implemented during the two most recent rounds of review. (3000 chars)

Thank you very much for responding to the survey!

For more information about the peer review changes that have been implemented at NIH, please visit <http://enhancing-peer-review.nih.gov/faqs.html>.

[<< Previous Page](#)

