7 February. 2011

Distribution Limited

Attachment A-3: Principal Investigator Survey for the Process Evaluation of the NIH Roadmap Epigenomics Program (NIDA) May 2011

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

7 February. 2011

Distribution Limited

OMB #: 0925-xxxx

Expiration Date: xx/xxxx

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 20 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Each time the assessment is completed, it is expected to be completed in a single sitting. **An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.** Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: NIH, Project Clearance Branch, 6705 Rockledge Drive, MSC 7974, Bethesda, MD 20892-7974, ATTN: PRA (0925-xxxx*). Do not return the completed form to this address.

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

7 February. 2011

Distribution Limited

NIH Roadmap Epigenomics Program Process Evaluation: Principal Investigator (PI) Survey

NIH has contracted with SSS to conduct a Process Evaluation of the Roadmap Epigenomics Program (EP). One aspect of this evaluation includes surveying grantees of the Program.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this questionnaire. We are interested in better understanding your perspectives on how the EP is progressing. The survey includes two parts: overall questions that all grantees will complete and then component-specific questions that you will complete for the component under which your research is funded.

The data collected here will be reported only in aggregated form over the whole program or over all responses from your RFA component, for the report to the NIH program staff. No personally-identifiable information will be asked. We are requesting information about your grant for data-coding use only.

After you read each question, mark the response that best presents your experience, using the categories listed.

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this survey.

Date: _____

My grant is funded under the following EP () component:

	Epigenomic Data Analysis and Coordination Center (EDACC)
	Reference Epigenome Mapping Center (REMC)
	Health and Human Disease (HHD)
	Novel Marks (NM)
	Technology Development (TD)

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

A. Common/Core Questions For All 5 Components

1. *Overall Epigenomics Program Synergies and Opportunities*

We are interested in your experience as a grantee of the Epigenomics Program (EP), including how your research has benefitted from this Roadmap Program. Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements by selecting **one (1)** response for each statement.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
The following statements pertain to the <u>Epigenomics Program overall</u>.						
1.	The EP has capitalized on the strengths of researchers across different research groups. Q2	,	,	,	,	,
2.	Unanticipated scientific advances have emerged from the EP. Q2; T1, T2, T4	,	,	,	,	,
3.	The annual All Hands meeting has been instrumental for internal (within the EP) sharing of research developed through EP funding. Q2; D5	,	,	,	,	,
4.	The Roadmap concept of supporting coordinated and interrelated research initiatives sponsored in collaboration by the Institutes is more scientifically productive than if each NIH Institute funded epigenomics-related research studies individually as has traditionally been done. Q2, Q3	,	,	,	,	,
The following statements pertain to research <u>within your group/at your institution</u>.						
5.	My research group is able to make a greater contribution to advancing the field of epigenomics as the result of ***new technologies*** developed by the Epigenomics Program. Q2; T4	,	,	,	,	,
6.	My research group has been able to work more effectively as the result of ***the resources produced*** (e.g., data, analytical tools) by the EP. Q3; E5, E7, E8, M15, M16 Please list the 2-3 resources that have had the greatest influence:	,	,	,	,	,
7.	My research group's outputs to date could not have occurred without our participation in the EP. Q2; T1, T2, T4	,	,	,	,	,

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

8. As you answer this question, please think of the Epigenomics Program as a whole (a planned research system with multiple, interdependent components). What would you say is the most important contribution the EP has made to the science of epigenomics?

   _____

   _____

9. My grant from the NIH Roadmap Epigenomics Program is the first funding I have received for **epigenomics** research.

   Yes _____ No_____

10. Since receiving the NIH Roadmap Epigenomics Program grant, I or a member of my research team have applied for and received funding for epigenomics research from other sources. T6, N2, N3

    Yes _____ No_____

11. NIH is interested in the ways that the unique features of the EP (e.g., planned synergies and collaborations among interdependent, diverse program components) have affected the nature of your work and/or your research outputs.

    Please briefly describe up to three of the most significant of these. T6

    1: _____
    2: _____
    3: _____

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

2. *Productivity and Efficiency*

12. My research group is able to do better and/or more work in the same amount of time because of collaboration that the EP has enabled. Q2; E5, E8, E9, M16, D5

    Yes _____ No_____

13. We are interested in the gains in productivity that you and your research group have experienced from being involved in the Epigenomics Program. In the table below, we have listed several work mechanisms that are used in the EP.

    Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means "Most Important [to your group's productivity]" and 5 means "Least Important," please rank the importance of the following work mechanisms in the EP in terms of the increased productivity of your research group.

	Work Mechanisms	**Rank**
a.	Participating in other EP activities beyond the research sponsored EP (e.g., All Hands meeting, data analysis workshops). Q2; E5, E8, D5 Briefly describe these types of activities(no matter what rank you have given this mechanism _____	
b.	Collaborating with other EP grantees. E5, M15	
c.	*New technologies* developed by the EP. E5	
d.	*Resources (other than new technologies) produced* by the EP. Q3; E5, E7, E8, M15, M16	

For the items you ranked 1 and 2, please describe briefly how these have helped you and your group become more productive or effective.

1: _____

2: _____

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

3. Innovations

14. Has your EP research work yielded any significant innovations? These can include both anticipated and unanticipated innovations. Q2; T1, T2, T4

Yes _____ No_____

If you answered "Yes," please describe each one briefly and answer the following questions about 3 of the most significant of these innovations:

1: _____

Would this innovation have occurred without the Epigenomics Program's uniqueness (a planned research system with multiple, interdependent components)?

Yes _____ No_____

Was this innovation expected (described in your original research proposal)?

Yes _____ No_____

2: _____

Would this innovation have occurred without the Epigenomics Program's uniqueness (a planned research system with multiple, interdependent components)?

Yes _____ No_____

Was this innovation expected (described in your original research proposal)?

Yes _____ No_____

3: _____

Would this innovation have occurred without the Epigenomics Program's uniqueness (a planned research system with multiple, interdependent components)?

Yes _____ No_____

Was this innovation expected (described in your original research proposal)?

Yes _____ No_____

15. In your judgment, to what extent have the EDACC and REMCs together advanced the state of epigenetic science? Q3

a great deal	a fair amount	a little	not at all	Can't say/no opinion
,	,	,	,	,

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

4. Research Progress

NIH is interested in how the science of epigenomics is being advanced as the result of the work produced by the EP grantees. The purpose of these questions is to understand how your research has progressed and the factors, positive and negative as well as expected and unexpected, which may have facilitated or hindered your progress. (Progress in research includes the pace and direction of research, as well as the value of outcomes.)

16. My research has progressed as I originally proposed in the grant application.
Q2; E1, E2, T5

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Can't say/no opinion
,	,	,	,	,

a. If you selected "disagree" or "strongly disagree," please describe briefly the positive or negative changes. (This could include, for example, that you found new information that altered your original hypothesis, that a new or improved technique became available, that you found a better way or new technique from your original proposal, or that you encountered delays in obtaining needed equipment.)

_____

17. The technical results achieved to date in my EP-funded research have met or exceeded my initial expectations. Q2; T1

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Can't say/no opinion
,	,	,	,	,

18. If you chose "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree," please provide 1 or 2 reasons for this:
1: _____
2: _____

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

5. *Access to and Use of Epigenomics Program Resources*

We are interested in your perspective on the resources developed and available from the Roadmap Epigenomics Program.

19. Please indicate how frequently your research group has used resources developed through the EP in your research and/or whether you plan to use a resource in the future. Please fill in the table below, responding to this.

		Indicate the number of times this resource has been used by your research group				**If response is 0, please respond below**	
		0	**1-2**	**3-5**	**> 5**	**Not currently using but plan to in the future**	**Not applicable to my work**
a.	Mapping data available from the EDACC (through Genboree) M3, M8?					,	,
b.	Data analysis tools (available from EDACC, REMC) M3					,	,
c.	New technologies developed by ~~1~~ one or more of the EP grantees					,	,

20. We are interested in how accessible these resources were to you when you needed them. Please describe briefly any factors facilitating or hindering your ability to get access to and use these.

a. Mapping data

20.a.1. Facilitating factors: _____

20.a.2. Hindering factors: _____

b. Data analysis tools

20.b.1. Facilitating factors: _____

20.b.2. Hindering factors: _____

c. New Technologies

20.c.1. Facilitating factors: _____

20.c.2. Hindering factors: _____

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

21. We are interested in your perspectives on the quality and usefulness of the products and resources that have been developed through the Epigenomics Program.

    Please rate the following products that have been developed through the EP.

		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not using this resource
a.	Quality of mapping data available from the EDACC (through Genboree) Q3; E3, E4, M11	,	,	,	,	,
b.	Usefulness of data analysis tools (available from EDACC, REMC) Q3; E4	,	,	,	,	,
c.	Usefulness of tools shared by EDACC for processing data in an expedient manner Q3; E5	,	,	,	,	,
d.	Usefulness of tools provided by EDACC which reduce errors in our data. Q3; E5	,	,	,	,	,
e.	The ease of navigating the Genboree (EDACC) web site	,	,	,	,	,
f.	Usefulness of new technologies developed by one or more of the EP grantees M4	,	,	,	,	,

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

6. Collaboration

Outside of the Epigenomics Program's formal meetings and work group sessions, please indicate how many times in the last 12 months you have met or communicated with an EP grantee in each of the following EP components.

	Component	Not at all	1-2 times	3-5 times	More than 5 times	Does not apply
22.	Roadmap genomic Mapping Centers (REMC) M6, M12	,	,	,	,	,
23.	EDACC M12	,	,	,	,	,
24.	Technology Development in epigenetics M12	,	,	,	,	,
25.	Epigenomics of Human Health and Disease M12	,	,	,	,	,
26.	Discovery of Novel epigenetic Marks in Mammalian Cells M12	,	,	,	,	,

27. Please briefly describe the 3 most useful interactions. Include a description of the structure/format of the interaction as well as what made the interaction useful. If possible include the results or outputs of the interaction.

    Example: I called a Technology Development grantee to discuss the joint submission of an abstract to an upcoming scientific meeting. At his suggestion, we used a technology his group developed in our research and we are beginning to see results. Our abstract was accepted and we presented our work at the American Society of Hematology (ASH) Annual Meeting.

    a. _____
    b. _____
    c. _____

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

Distribution Limited

We are interested in your perspectives on the collaboration **among and across the 5 EP components**.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
28.	My research team has found EP grantees to be very willing to collaborate, irrespective of component. M5, M6	,	,	,	,	,
29.	As a result of interactions with grantees from other EP components, we have produced results that are unlikely to have been developed otherwise. M5, M6	,	,	,	,	,

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

We are interested in your perspectives on any collaboration you and your research team have had ***with other Epigenomics Program grantees.***

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
30.	Since working on my EP-funded research, I have increased the degree to which I collaborate with researchers outside my primary discipline. T2, N2	,	,	,	,	,
31.	In general, the EP-related collaboration has increased my research productivity. E5, M15	,	,	,	,	,
32.	In general, EP-related collaboration has improved the quality of my research.	,	,	,	,	,

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

7. *Effect of EDACC's work on other grantees*

Please rate your level of agreement regarding the work produced by EDACC or made available on Genboree.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
33.	My research group has become more productive as the result of the ***data and maps*** produced by the EP.	,	,	,	,	,
34.	My research group is making a greater contribution to the field of epigenomics as the result of the ***data and maps*** produced by the EP.	,	,	,	,	,
35.	EDACC has provided the resources (e.g. data analysis tools, mapping data, data integration and analysis) we need for publishing results from EP -funded research. M10, M11	,	,	,	,	,
36.	Resources developed by EDACC have enabled new functionality or the extension of existing functionality for the epigenomics research community. M4, M5, M6, M10, M11	,	,	,	,	,
37.	EP meetings (informatics workgroup meetings, data analysis workshops) have been highly productive. M11?	,	,	,	,	,

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

8. External Outreach and Dissemination of Scientific Knowledge

One of the goals of the Epigenomics Program is to advance the science of epigenomics by ensuring the rapid spread of scientific knowledge and resources from your EP research to scientific communities and researchers **beyond** the funded Epigenomics Program.

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

		Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**No Opinion**
38.	The EP has led to new opportunities for my research group to collaborate with researchers **outside** of the epigenomics Program. E8	,	,	,	,	,
39.	Our research funded under the EP has benefited greatly from our interactions with **non-EP researchers** working on epigenomics research. E8	,	,	,	,	,

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

Distribution Limited

In the period of time that you and your research group have been working on Epigenomics Program-funded research, how many times have you or done the following as part of the EP?

		At least quarterly	Several times	Once or twice	Not at all	Does not apply
40.	Presented EP-funded research at regional or national scientific meetings, conferences, or seminars. D6, T6	,	,	,	,	,
41.	Initiated communication (personal contact such as phone or email) with an epigenetics researcher **outside of** the EP grantee group. D6, E8	,	,	,	,	,
42.	Been contacted by a **non-EP** Roadmap-funded researcher to discuss work being done by the epigenomics Program. D6, E8	,	,	,	,	,
43.	Had ad hoc/informal networking discussions on EP-funded research at professional meetings, conferences, or other formal gatherings. D6, T6	,	,	,	,	,
44.	Published EP-funded research in a professional journal (print or online versions). D6, T6	,	,	,	,	,
45.	Had EP-funded research results published in conference presentations and/or proceedings. D6, T6	,	,	,	,	,

46. Please list titles of the 3 most recent scientific meetings/conferences at which you have presented results from your EP research. D5

Name of Conference/Meeting	Presentation Title	Month/Year

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

9. Additional Comments

47. Please share any additional comments you have related to the Epigenomics Program in the space provided below. If the comments pertain to a specific question in the survey, please note the question number next to your comment.

_____

B. Component-Specific Questions

Please click on the link for the component under which your grant was awarded. This will take you to the relevant questions for that component.

EDACC

REMCs

Human Health and Disease

Technology Development

Novel Marks

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

1. *EDACC (E)*

One important aspect of the EP is the interaction and collaborative work between the EDACC and the REMCs, and among the EDACC, NIH, and External Science Panel (ESP). Please rate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements about these collaborations.

		Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Can't Say/No Opinion**
E.1.	The EP Steering Committee and ESP members readily consider suggestions for accomplishing the work of the epigenomics Program. M1, M2	,	,	,	,	,
E.2.	The REMCs have worked collaboratively with EDACC to meet EP goals. E5, E6	,	,	,	,	,
E.3.	The processes that EDACC has developed for REMCs to feed data into the data pipeline have worked effectively. E3	,	,	,	,	,
E.4.	The REMCs are complying with the standards for data submission and timelines. E6	,	,	,	,	,
E.5.	REMC and EDACC consortium members are working well together to address common challenges. Q3; M2, M3, M4, M11	,	,	,	,	,
E.6.	There has been minimal duplication of effort between the REMCs and EDACC. Q3; M10	,	,	,	,	,
E.7.	The requirement to coordinate and collaborate on research among the REMCs has led to results that wouldn't have been possible if funded as individual research projects. Q3; M16	,	,	,	,	,

E.8. If you answered question E.7 above as "Strongly Agree" or "Agree," please give 1-2 examples of specific results:

a. _____

b. _____

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

Distribution Limited

NIH is interested to learn how the quality of REMC data submission has improved over time. Please evaluate the submission of data by the REMCs.

What percent of the REMC data submitted to EDACC was EDACC able to move to Level 1.... Q3

		0 to 25%	**26%-50%**	**51%-75%**	**76%-100%**
E.9.	...in the first two times a specific REMC submitted data?	,	,	,	,
E.10.	...in the past 3 months?	,	,	,	,

What percent of the REMCs met the deadlines for data submission.... Q3

		0 to 25%	**26%-50%**	**51%-75%**	**76%-100%**
E.11.	...in the first two times a specific REMC submitted data?	,	,	,	,
E.12.	...in the past 3 months?	,	,	,	,

Return to Component-Specific Questions Main Page

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

2. *REMCs - Mapping Centers (M)*

One important aspect of the EP is the interaction and collaborative work between the REMCs and the EDACC and with the NIH and ESP. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about these collaborations.

		Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Can't Say/No Opinion**
M.2.	The EP Steering committee and ESP members readily consider suggestions for accomplishing the work of the Epigenomics Program. M1, M2	,	,	,	,	,
M.3.	The REMCs have collaborated effectively with the EDACC to meet EP goals. E5, E6	,	,	,	,	,
M.4.	The REMCs are complying with the EDACC standards for data submission and timelines. E6	,	,	,	,	,
M.5.	REMC and EDACC consortium members are working well together to address common challenges. Q3; M2, M3, M4, M11	,	,	,	,	,
M.6.	There has been minimal duplication of effort between the REMCs and EDACC. Q3; M10	,	,	,	,	,
M.7.	The requirement to coordinate and collaborate on research among the REMCs has led to results that wouldn't have been possible if funded as individual research projects. Q3; M16	,	,	,	,	,

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

M.8. If you answered question M7 above as "Strongly Agree" or "Agree," please give 1-2 examples of specific results:

a. _____

b. _____

REMCs as a functional consortium

M.9. One of the visions that NIH had in developing the EP was to have REMCs working together as a functional consortium. Please rate how effectively you feel the REMCs are operating as a functional consortium, using each of the attributes in the table below.

		Excellent	**Good**	**Satisfactory**	**Poor**	**Can't Say/No Opinion**
a.	Overall collaboration at meetings E8?	,	,	,	,	,
b.	Selecting cell types	,	,	,	,	,
c.	Sharing protocols M10	,	,	,	,	,
d.	Sharing information on reagents	,	,	,	,	,
e.	Developing tools collaboratively M10, M11, M14, M15	,	,	,	,	,
f.	Participating in focused and productive Steering Committee calls Q3; M10, M11, M14, M15	,	,	,	,	,

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

M.10. The Steering Committee (SC) was not originally envisioned to be as active and continual a steering group as it now is, with meetings on a bi-weekly basis and with the addition of Workgroups to make progress.

Please rate the effect and usefulness of the SC functioning in the table below.

		Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Can't Say/No Opinion**
a.	The regular and continual involvement of the SC has been necessary for the REMCs and EDACC to coordinate their work. Q3	,	,	,	,	,
b.	The SC bi-weekly meetings have an essential function in ensuring the progress of the EP and for moving the EP in the right direction. Q3	,	,	,	,	,
c.	The work of the SC has been important for transforming the way epigenomics research is conducted.	,	,	,	,	,
d.	The regular and continual involvement of the SC has been necessary for the output of the REMCs and EDACC to be of high quality. Q3	,	,	,	,	,
e.	The addition of the Workgroups has ensured that the output of the REMCs and EDACC is timely and responsive to the needs of the scientific community. Q3	,	,	,	,	,

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

Collaboration with EDACC

We are interested in your perspectives on your collaboration with EDACC. Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Can't Say/ No Opinion
M.11.	By working with EDACC, I have been able to increase my research group's productivity significantly. Q2; M11	,	,	,	,	,
M.12.	The process for submitting data to the EDACC was reasonable. Q3; M3, M4	,	,	,	,	,
M.13.	EDACC's turn-around time for the data submitted by my mapping center was acceptable. Q3; M3, M4	,	,	,	,	,
M.14.	EDACC has provided my mapping center with tools for processing the data in a reasonably expedient manner. Q3; M3, M4	,	,	,	,	,
M.15.	Overall, EDACC has developed efficient processes and quality assurance for the data pipeline. E3	,	,	,	,	,
M.16.	EDACC has developed and shared standardized data sharing protocols among REMCs. Q3; E3, E8, M10, M11	,	,	,	,	,

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

Collaboration with Other EP Grantees

The questions below are about collaborating with grantees outside of your collaboration with EDACC. Please select your level of agreement with each statement.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Can't Say/No Opinion
M.17.	The REMCs are effectively collaborating with EP Health and Disease awardees to identify epigenetic marks in select cell lines and tissues. M10, D5	,	,	,	,	,
M.18.	Disease-based epigenomic projects are using data and maps from the REMCs (via EDACC/Genboree).	,	,	,	,	,

Cost Efficiencies

In the RFA for REMCs, NIH asked applicants to demonstrate "an understanding of costs and how to track them…. to approach effectively the goal of lowering costs and achieving economies of scale. Applicants should propose a cost model that accommodates the proposed process." Please respond to the following questions specific to this aspect of your REMC grant.

M.19. Please identify in the table below the categories and extent of expected cost savings stated in your grant application. In the third column of the table, rate to what extent the expected savings have been realized at this point (*2 years* into your grant period) by writing in letter A, B, or C (consistent with the legend below).Q3; M16

A= We have achieved **much greater** cost savings than we expected/planned for.
B= We have achieved **some cost savings** beyond what we expected/planned for.
C= We have **not yet achieved** the cost savings that we expected/planned for.

Cost Category	Extent of Cost Savings	Extent expected savings realized
a.1.		
a.2.		
a.3.		
a.4.		
a.5.		

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

M.20. If you selected "much greater cost savings" or "some cost savings", please describe at least 3 of these specific savings (e.g., your lab can produce more maps now for the same amount of funding). M16

a.1. _____
a.2. _____
a.3. _____
a.4. _____
a.5. _____

M.21. If you selected "not yet achieved the cost savings" please describe the challenges that you encountered. M16

a.1. _____
a.2. _____
a.3. _____
a.4. _____
a.5. _____

M.22. NIH is interested in your unit costs for a running a data sample. Has your unit cost gone down since the beginning of the project? ___ Yes ___No M16

a. If Yes, please estimate (using a percentage) how much it has gone down _____%

b. What specific cost efficiencies have contributed to this? Please list at least 3-5:

b.1. _____
b.2. _____
b.3. _____
b.4. _____
b.5. _____

M.23. What are the factors that have helped or hindered your research group's work in achieving cost efficiencies? Please list 3-5 below and specify whether these factors have helped or have hindered your research group's epigenomics research. Q3; M16

	Helped	Hindered
a.	,	,
b.	,	,
c.	,	,
d.	,	,
e.	,	,

Return to Component-Specific Questions Main Page

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

3. Human Health and Disease (D)

D.1. In your project proposal, you were asked to describe how your research would affect/improve a specific area of public health. Based on the current status of your project and research findings, has the potential impact of your studies on public health changed or expanded to other areas? D5

__ yes ___no

a. If yes, please describe:

_____

_____

D.2. NIH is interested in the ways in which you obtain and/or use epigenomic data for your research. D5

Please rate your frequency of use for the following sites:

		I have used this site most frequently	**I have used this site frequently**	**I have used this site once in awhile**	**I have never used this site**
a.	NCBI Epigenomics Gateway http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/igenomics	,	,	,	,
b.	UCSC browser website http://www.igenomebrowser.org/	,	,	,	,
c.	The Genboree site http://www.genboree.org/igenomeatlas/index.rhtml	,	,	,	,
d.	The Roadmap epigenomics Project website http://www.roadmapigenomics.org	,	,	,	,
e.	Roadmap epigenomics Visualization Hub http://genomebrowser.wustl.edu	,	,	,	,

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

D.3.When accessing data for your Roadmap EP research, we are interested in which site you use most frequently as well as what data you download from different sites and for what use(s)? (You do not need to share proprietary details, but please describe generally how you use the data.) Please fill in the table below with this information.

		I have used this site most frequently	**This is the type of data I download from the site for EP-related use and generally how I use it**
a.	NCBI epigenomics Gateway http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/epigenomics	,	
b.	UCSC browser website http://www.epigenomebrowser.org/	,	
c.	The Genboree site http://www.genboree.org/epigenomeatlas/index.rhtml	,	
d.	The Roadmap epigenomics Project website http://www.roadmapepigenomics.org/	,	
e.	Roadmap Epigenomics Visualization Hub http://genomebrowser.wustl.edu/	,	

D.4. Have you ever logged onto and participated in the Genboree Community Support Site (GCSS) (http://www.genboree.org/gcss/login?back_url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.genboree.org%2Fgcss%2F)? D5

__ yes ___no

a. If yes, please describe what you have used the GCSS for:

_____

_____

b. If you have not logged onto and participated in the GCSS, please briefly let us know why not

_____

_____

D.5. NIH is also interested in whether or not you have uploaded data from your research results (funded by the EP) to one of the sites listed above. Have you uploaded data to one of the sites listed above? D6

__ yes ___no

a. If yes, please specify to which one and why you chose that particular site:

_____

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

One potential strength of the EP is the opportunity for collaboration between REMCs and Health and Human Disease grantees in identifying epigenetic marks in select cell lines and tissues. Please rate the effectiveness of this aspect below.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Can't Say/No Opinion
D.6.	The REMCs are effectively collaborating with EP Health and Disease grantees to identify epigenetic marks in select cell lines and tissues. M10, D5	,	,	,	,	,

a. If you answered "Strongly Agree" or "Agree," please tell us, in your experience, what has been the most effective means of accomplishing the collaborations?

_____

b. If you answered "disagree" or "strongly disagree", please provide 1-2 reasons for this:

b.1. _____

b.2. _____

Return to Component-Specific Questions Main Page

4. Technology Development (T)

T.1. NIH expected that grantees receiving technology development awards would develop and then make available these technologies to EP grantees and other epigenetics researchers outside of this Program. T1, T2

Please rate how effective each of the following venues has been as a place for you to communicate to other EP participants and non-EP researchers about the technologies your research group has developed.

		Most effective	Fairly effective	Somewhat effective	Not at all effective	Can't say/ no opinion
a.	Networking at EP professional meetings and conferences	,	,	,	,	,
b.	Networking at non-EP professional meetings and conferences	,	,	,	,	,
c.	Informal communication on a personal basis	,	,	,	,	,
d.	Printed in conference presentations and proceedings	,	,	,	,	,
e.	ejournals and prints available on the Web	,	,	,	,	,
f.	Publications in professional journals	,	,	,	,	,
g.	Other (please specify): _____	,	,	,	,	,

T.2. To what extent has your technology development research targeted specific diseases or public health applications? T3, T7

a great deal	a fair amount	a little	not at all	Can't say/no opinion
,	,	,	,	,

a. If you answered "a great deal" or "a fair amount," please identify the technology and the disease or public health application:

_____

_____

Return to Component-Specific Questions Main Page

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

5. Novel Marks (N)

N.1. Have you identified one or more novel marks under the research funded by the EP? N3

__ yes ___no

a. If yes, please list the marks you have developed and whether you have published these results yet:

Novel Mark	Published Results?

N.2. Are you aware of research by other researchers on the marks you have identified in your EP - funded Novel Marks project?

__ yes ___no

a. If yes, please list 1 or 2 examples of the type of research that is being conducted with your novel mark(s) discovery:

Research	Mark

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

NIH expected that grantees receiving Novel Marks awards would identify and then make these marks available to EP grantees and other epigenetics researchers.

N.3. We are interested in determining how you have communicated about the availability of the novel marks you have identified to both the EP grantees and to outside researchers. N2

Please use the table below to identify which mechanisms you have used to inform other EP participants and non-EP researchers about the novel marks your research group has developed.

		Most effective	Fairly effective	Somewhat effective	Not at all effective	Can't say/ no opinion
a.	Networking at EP professional meetings and conferences	,	,	,	,	,
b.	Networking at non-EP professional meetings and conferences	,	,	,	,	,
c.	Informal communication on a personal basis	,	,	,	,	,
d.	Printed in conference presentations and proceedings	,	,	,	,	,
e.	ejournals and prints available on the Web	,	,	,	,	,
f.	Publications in professional journals	,	,	,	,	,
g.	Other (please specify): _____	,	,	,	,	,

N.4. We are interested in how your research has unfolded in terms of the time expectations for the process of discovering novel marks. Please select the statement that best describes your research situation at this time.

a. It's too soon in the research to have discovered and validated one or more novel marks.
b. At this time, we have discovered *one or more* novel marks and are in the process of validating them.
c. We have discovered novel marks and moved them, but have not yet validated them because it is too early in the research.

Red font refers to the evaluation questions addressed (from data sources matrix: EP eval Qx Indic Data sources detailed 19Dec1.xls)

N.5. In the RFA for your grant, NIH laid out this expectation:

> "Global mapping of novel marks is beyond the scope of the current FOA, but it is anticipated that results from this initiative would be rapidly translated to genome wide mapping in human tissues through Roadmap funded epigenomics centers."

We are interested in your plans for this, given that your research is in early stages and is not likely to be ready at this stage. Please briefly describe below your plan to do move these marks on to global mapping through the REMCs and public Web sites.

	Brief Description of My Plans
I plan to move the novel marks we develop and validate to global mapping through **one of the EP's REMCs.**	
I plan to move the novel marks we develop and validate to global mapping through **another epigenomic website** (Please identify which one: _____)	

Return to Component-Specific Questions Main Page