

ANA POST PEER PANEL SURVEY

THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13) Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.08 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining the data needed, 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.

I. REVIEW MANAGEMENT

1. The quality of reviewer recruitment and confirmation communications.

Unacceptable

Poor

No Opinion

Good

Excellent

Comment

2. The helpfulness of the logistical information provided to conduct a successful review.

Unacceptable

Poor

No Opinion

Good

Excellent

Comment

3. Overall review management.

Unacceptable

Poor

No Opinion

Good

Excellent

Comment

4. The "user friendliness" and overall user experience of ARM.

Unacceptable

Poor

No Opinion

Good

Excellent

Comment

5. I received clear explanations of the conflict of interest and the confidentiality requirements regarding information about applications, and grant review comments and scores.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

6. The compensation I received was commensurate with the time and effort required.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

II. REVIEWER TRAINING

1. The quality of the Mandatory Training (please consider the quality of the information shared, as well as the PowerPoint presentations, teleconferences, and/ or webinars).

Unacceptable

Poor

No Opinion

Good

Excellent

Comment

2. The quality of the Program Support Web Page (please consider all aspects including the accessibility, organization, and presentation of required documents, forms, training materials, and other items).

Unacceptable

Poor

No Opinion

Good

Excellent

Comment

3. The helpfulness of the guidance materials provided on the Program Support Web Page.

Unacceptable

Poor

No Opinion

Good

Excellent

Comment

4. The helpfulness of the programmatic information focused on understanding the Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) and guidance for reviewing the grant applications.

Unacceptable

Poor

No Opinion

Good

Excellent

Comment

III. THE OVERALL REVIEW PROCESS

1. The format used for panel discussions (Teleconference, Webinar).

Unacceptable

Poor

No Opinion

Good

Excellent

Comment

2. Your overall satisfaction with the review experience.

Unacceptable

Poor

No Opinion

Good

Excellent

Comment

3. The two weeks allotted to read and panel the assigned applications was

Too Long

Just Right

Too Short

4. I would participate in another ANA Panel Review.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

Comment

5. Overall, I had a positive experience with this review.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

ONLY TO BE FILLED OUT BY CHAIRPERSON.

Dear Panel Chairperson,

Your feedback is valuable. Please take a few minutes to complete our survey. We would especially appreciate comments for items that did not meet your satisfaction so we may further improve future grant review sessions. Your feedback is confidential and will not be shared with other members of your panel or the public. This survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Thank you.

Chairperson - Overall Grant Review Process

1. The training I received effectively prepared me as a chair for the grant review process.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

2. The guidance I received from the program office (SAM) was consistent with the FOA, including the FOA's evaluation criteria.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

EVALUATION OF PANEL REVIEWERS:

3. The reviewer was knowledgeable about the subject matter related to this review.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

4. The reviewer had access to technology and adequate computer skills.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

5. The reviewer attended all panel review discussions.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

6. The reviewer was on time to panel * review discussions

None of the Time

Some of the Time

Most of the Time

All of the Time

N/A

7. The reviewer respected and cooperated with other panel members.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

8. The reviewer read and clearly understood the applications being reviewed, the FOA, and the evaluation criteria.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

9. The reviewer's summary comments were well-written, specific, constructive, and based on the strengths and weaknesses of an application's response to the evaluation criteria.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

10. The reviewer assigned applications scores that were consistent with * written comments.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

11. I would recommend this reviewer for future panel reviews.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

ONLY TO BE FILLED OUT BY PANELIST.

Dear Panelist,

Your feedback is valuable. Please take a few minutes to complete our performance and process survey. We would especially appreciate comments for items that did not meet your satisfaction so we may further improve future grant review sessions. Your feedback is confidential and will not be shared with other members of your panel or the public. Thank you.

1. The panel chairperson clearly established administrative and procedural rules for the review (e.g. established a schedule, ensured reviewers had received all needed materials, and established groundrules).

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

2. The panel chairperson instructed reviewers to use only the guidance from the FOA evaluation criteria in evaluating applications.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

3. The panel chairperson effectively led panel discussions and facilitated meetings.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

4. The panel chairperson effectively resolved any differences of opinion that arose between reviewers in regard to scoring applications.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

N/A

5. The panel chairperson effectively led the process of developing the Panel Summary Reports.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

6. Overall, the panel chairperson was effective in managing this review.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

7. Please include any additional comments in the space below.