

**ATTACHMENT A.3.2: ONLINE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY FOR APPLICANTS
(HOST INSTITUTIONS)**

OMB# 0925-XXXX EXP. DATE: XX/XX/XXXX

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY FOR HOST INSTITUTIONS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 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. 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 (0925-0476). Do not return the completed form to this address.

Please note that you can stop at any time and return to complete the survey at a later day. The submission deadline is [**Insert Date**] (11:59pm EST).

For purpose of this survey, the term "candidate" refers to the exceptional junior scientist that applies as the principal investigator with a host institution.

Section I. Recruitment and selection of candidates

1. How did your institution learn about the Early Independence Award (EIA) program? Please check all that apply.
 The NIH website (webpage, e-newsletter posting, blog, etc.)
 An NIH-sponsored listserv email or notice
 NIH news release
 Posted announcement in the NIH Nexus
 Your institution's listserv email or notice
 A notice from a professional society
 Other (please specify): _____
2. How did your institution recruit potential candidates within and/or outside the institution?
3. What was the total number of candidates your institution had? _____
4. How many internal candidates (i.e., within the institution) sought to receive support for the EIA program at your institution? _____
5. How many external candidates (i.e., outside the institution) applied at your institution to receive support for the EIA program? _____
6. What were your institution's selection criteria (e.g., publication records, active pending support, high-risk and innovative research, collaborative approach, scientific area, institution priorities, references, awards and honors, leadership, etc.)?
7. What was the process by which your institution selected candidate(s)? Please select only one option
 My institution had a formal process (e.g., written procedures for reviewing and selecting candidates)
Please describe the review/approval process, including the materials requested from candidates: _____
 My institution had an informal process (e.g., no written procedures for reviewing and selecting candidates)
Please explain: _____
8. Is your institution considering changes to the recruitment and selection process in the future?
 Yes.
Please list the changes being considered _____
 No
9. What challenges do you anticipate the position/appointment created by the EIA program may pose for your institution?
10. What plans does your institution have for your candidate(s) if they do not receive an NIH Award (e.g., provide institutional funds as an independent fellow; connect with a mentor for a traditional post-doc, enroll in clinical fellowship, etc.)?

Section II. NIH EIA Grant Application

11. What challenges did your institution encounter in preparing the content of the NIH grant application to comply with the RFA instructions for the EIA program?

Section III. Suggestions

12. Would your institution be willing to support more than two Early Independent PIs if allowed?
13. What are alternative methods for matching host institutions and candidates that might be more effective than the current method? Examples may include, awarding grants to institutions which then find suitable candidates, or allowing NIH to match host institutions and candidates.
14. How could NIH improve the EIA program (e.g., eligibility requirements, RFA instructions, letters of recommendations, review criteria, length of time, size and number of awards, etc.) to make it more attractive to your institution?