National Institutes of Health
The Nation's Medical Research Agency

NIH Center for Scientific Review

2012 IRG Stakeholder Survey

OMB Control Number: 0925-0474 Expiration Date 10/31/2014

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.

Thank you in advance for participating in the 2012 IRG Stakeholder Survey at the National Institutes of Health, Center for Scientific Review. We are in the process of examining the effectiveness of NIH/CSR Integrated Review Groups and your input is very important to us.

Regarding your participation in the NIH/CSR study section review meetings, please respond to the following statements.

Roster quality *(expert review)*

1. Considering both the applications typically reviewed in the study section you served on and the need to ensure a balanced and diverse panel- the roster of the study section you served on is an assembly of qualified and respected scientists with expertise well matched to application content.

- ○ Strongly agree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Strongly disagree

Reviewer training *(communication of role, policy, practice, and expectations)*

2. Training in *policy* provided by the SRO allowed the panel to be

able to discharge its duties competently.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

3. Training in *practice and procedures* provided by the SRO allowed the panel to be able to discharge its duties competently.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

4. Expectations of diligence and the importance of deadlines were clearly explained to the panel by the SRO before the meeting.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

5. The expertise of reviewers was appropriately matched to application content (please consider the need to balance reviewer workloads and ensure broad perspective).

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

6. Reviewers used the following sources for information when they needed it (check all that apply)

- CSR Website
- The SRO
- The Chair
- Other Reviewers
- Colleagues and friends

Meeting management *(implementation of policy and practice)*

7. Rate the panel, as a whole, on its ability to identify the most promising science.

- The panel recognizes significant ideas and is not risk averse
- The panel recognizes significant ideas but is risk averse when voting impact scores
- The panel is risk averse and does not recognize significant ideas
- The panel does not recognize significant ideas and is risk averse

8. Oral presentations by the reviewers at the meeting were indicative of careful preparation.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

9. Oral presentations by the reviewers at the meeting were indicative of demonstrated scientific insight.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

10. In preparation for the meeting, how many critiques by colleagues did you read? (insert number in box)

11. The SRO exhibited leadership and competence during the pre-meeting and meeting phases of the study section by:	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Recruiting appropriate reviewers:	○	○	○	○	○
Making appropriate application assignments:	○	○	○	○	○
Conducting an informative pre-meeting teleconference:	○	○	○	○	○
Training Reviewers:	○	○	○	○	○
Managing discussions in collaboration with the Chair:	○	○	○	○	○
Clarifying policy questions:	○	○	○	○	○

12. The Chair was well prepared for the meeting.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

13. The Chair conducted the scientific discussions in a respectful and professional environment.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

14. Written critiques were informative and scientifically insightful.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

15. At the meeting, the discussions were scientifically insightful and the panel was able to identify the most promising applications in a fair and rigorous manner.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Thank you for your responses, please click on 'finish' to complete the survey.

Finish Save