

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 50 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-XXXX). Do not return the completed form to this address.

## NHLBI Proteomic Centers Program Study Key Informant Interview Guide – Trainees and Junior Investigators

### Interview Information

Interviewee:		
Title:		
Interview Format	<input type="checkbox"/> In-person	<input type="checkbox"/> Phone <input type="checkbox"/> Skype/video chat
Phone/Email:		
Video chat ID:	Skype:	GooglePlus:
Date:	Start time:	End time:
Interviewer:		

### Introduction

*Opening Script:* Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. My name is \_\_\_\_\_, and I am with Concept Systems, Inc. We are an evaluation firm that has been contracted to conduct an evaluation of the NHLBI Proteomics Centers Program (which I will refer to as "the Program" from now on).

The overall goals of the evaluation are to better understand the contributions of the Program and the experiences of the Program staff and affiliates. Please note that this evaluation is being performed with the understanding that each Center within the Program is unique based on its areas of concentration. To that end, the findings of the evaluation will not be used to compare individual Centers.

This interview is designed to take about 45-50 minutes, though you are welcome to continue our discussion beyond that time if you choose. I will take notes during the interview and, with your permission, I will also audio record the interview. This project is not research and does not require IRB review. However, your participation in this interview is voluntary. You have the option of ending the interview at any time, and you are also free to skip any questions that you would prefer not to answer.

Please note that this evaluation only covers the past five years of the NHLBI Proteomics Centers Program, from 2010 to 2015. If you were involved in previous iterations of this program, please make sure that your responses to my questions reflect your experience only over the past five years.

The information you provide will not be disclosed to anyone but the researchers conducting the study, except otherwise required by law. With that said, are you willing to continue with the interview? [YES/NO]. And is it okay if I audio record the interview? [YES/NO]

Do you have any questions before we begin? Let's get started.

### Background Questions

*Script:* First, I want to gather some basic information about your role and position.

1. Please verify the following background information:

Title:	
Center/Organization:	

2. During what years have you worked at the Center? \_\_\_\_\_
- a. If before 2010, prompt: In responding to my questions, please remember that we are focused only on the past 5 years.
3. Did your position or title change during that time? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
4. Very briefly, how would you describe your current role at the Center? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

**Section A: Scientific Advancements & Influence of the Program**

*Script:* I would like to begin by asking you some questions about the scientific advancements made through the Program over the past five years, and the influence of the Program in the fields of proteomics and heart, lung, and blood research.

5. Thinking back over the past five years, what would you say are the top two or three major discoveries or advancements to come out of your Center?
- a. How, if at all, would you say these discoveries have influenced proteomics research and heart, lung, and blood research?

--

6. Broadly speaking, what were the goals that your Center set out to achieve related to research applicable to clinical or translational questions?

--

7. What, if any, specific discoveries, knowledge advances, or tools emerged from the work of your lab or group that contributed to achieving these goals?

--

**Section B: Application & Dissemination of New Knowledge and Tools**

*Script:* Great. Now I am going to ask you about the application and dissemination of knowledge and tools developed through the Program.

- 8. In what ways, if at all, did you and your colleagues access new knowledge, methods, or tools created through the other Centers?
  - a. In what ways, if at all, was this information integrated into your work and research?

**Section C: Collaboration**

*Script:* Now I would like to ask you about the role that collaboration played in your work and the work of your Center.

- 9. In your role with the Center, in what ways, if any, have you been able to collaborate with other researchers outside of your lab or group?
  - a. With other researchers in the field?

- 10. How would you describe the value of these collaborations to your training and professional development?
  - a. To the work of your lab or Center?

- 11. In what ways, if any, do you intend to leverage or build on these collaborations going forward?

- 12. Now I would like to ask about more formal collaborations, specifically collaborations that involved working collectively with researchers outside of your lab or group to achieve a common goal. In your work at the Center, in what ways, if any, did you engage in formal collaborations with other researchers outside of your lab or group? With researchers outside of your Center?

- a. How would you describe the nature of these collaborative projects?
- b. How would you describe the value of these collaborations for your training or professional development?
- c. How would you describe the value of those collaborations for the work of your lab or group? For example, would you say that they were instrumental, generally productive, or generally unproductive?

13. Which of the following three terms best describes your training before joining the Center: Would you say your training was primarily in (1) proteomics/computation, (2) basic science/molecular studies, or (3) clinical studies?

- a. How, if at all, has your work at the Center influenced your interest in incorporating elements of the other two areas into your work going forward?
- b. Probe: For example, if your training was clinically focused, has your work at the Center made you consider incorporating computation or basic science into your work going forward? Or, has your work at the Center influenced you toward a more interdisciplinary approach?

#### **Section D: Recognition & Advancement**

*Script:* My final questions focus on the recognition and professional advancement of researchers involved in the Program.

14. I am going to ask you to consider the work and standing of the lead investigators involved in the Program. Relative to other leading investigators in the field, how would you characterize the leading investigators who are involved with the Program?

- a. For example, would you say they are on par with other investigators, exceptional in the field, or lagging behind other senior investigators in the field?

15. In what ways, if at all, has your work at the Center contributed to the advancement of your career?

16. How, if at all, do you expect to apply the skills and knowledge you gained at the Center in your career moving forward?

a. Do you intend to continue working in the field of proteomics? If so, in what capacity? If not, why?

17. That is the last of my formal questions. Before we close, is there anything about the Centers or the Program that you feel is important for us to know, that I didn't ask about?

**Closing Remarks**

*Script:* Thank you again for taking time out of your schedule to participate in this study. We will be using the data we collect through these interviews to inform our evaluation of the Program. If, after revisiting our interview, I have questions for clarification, is it okay if I contact you again? [YES/NO]

Great. Thank you again for your time. Please feel free to contact us if you have any follow-up questions or comments.

**Interviewer notes**

**Methodological comments**

- How did the process go? What worked well? What didn't?
- Functionality of or issues with the technology
- Observations on the questions/guide: (Redundancy; Flow; Specificity/generalality of the questions)
- Other

**Analytical comments**

- Thoughts/observations on the content of the interview
- Themes or connection
- Demeanor of interviewee
- Key new information
- Other