Contents

Grant Review Committee Structure

Chair

The Grant Review Committee will be chaired by the CSHP Research & Education Foundation Research Committee (RC) Chair. The role of the Chair:

1. To coordinate the process of grant application adjudication in a systematic, transparent, and fair manner.
2. To confirm the available funding to be granted by the Foundation each year prior to beginning the grant review process.
3. To manage actual or perceived conflicts of interest (COI) related to the Grant Review Committee.
4. May or may not be a primary reviewer of applications.
5. To be responsible for thoroughly communicating Grant Review Committee decisions to the Foundation in a manner that is detailed, transparent, and clear to both the Foundation and the applicant.
6. To be responsible for providing feedback to applicants on behalf of the Grant Review Committee.
7. To be the contact person for the Foundation and applicants to address any questions related to processes.
8. To update the grant review processes/tools after seeking CSHP Research Committee member input yearly.

Grant Review Committee Member Selection

The Chair will form the committee. The committee will be a sub-committee of the RC. Where practicable, the number of members on the Grant Review Committee will be such that there are enough members to be assigned as primary reviewer on no more than two applications. The number of primary reviews per member will fluctuate each year depending on numbers of applications and numbers of conflicts of interest.

Once the grant applications are submitted, the Chair will circulate the list of submitted project titles and their investigator team to the members of the Grant Review Committee. The Grant Review Committee members will then be asked to declare conflicts of interest, expertise and availability. The management of the declared COI will be left to the discretion of the Chair, with options including but not limited to: removing the member from the Grant Review Committee if practicable (desired option) or removing the member from review, scoring, and discussion related to a conflicting application.

RC members are required to participate on the sub-committee at least every 2 years. The Chair will select the committee based on these parameters.

Grant Review Committee Member Expectations

1. Declare actual or perceived COI to the Chair immediately before undertaking any review.
2. Cannot be a research investigation team member for any grant application.
3. Maintain confidentiality at all times related to the submissions. Do not disclose to other RC members which applications they are reviewing and do not disclose to anyone outside of the RC any information related to grant applications.
4. Must not contact any research team member of any grant application to discuss anything related to the application or decision.
5. Read and understand the processes outlined in this document.
6. Read and understand the Research Grant Competition Criteria and Submission Checklist.
7. Read and understand the Research Grant Competition Criteria for Evaluation of Submissions.
8. Read and understand the required budget and budget justification template.
9. Read and understand the example budget and budget justification that serves as a guide for applicants and Grant Committee Reviewers.
10. Independently review all grant applications (excluding declared conflicts of interest) for significance using the rubric outlined in the section "Significance of the Research" contained within the Research Grant Competition Criteria for Evaluation of Submissions.
11. Serve as one of two independent primary reviewers of assigned grant applications and provide detailed scores using the Criteria for Evaluation of Submissions and justification for scores. It is also expected that the reviewer will provide constructive feedback to all applicants on that form.
12. When serving as a primary reviewer, present a synopsis of the application to the Grant Review Committee using the Criteria for Evaluation as a guide.
13. Engage in collegial debate and discussion related to the primary review scoring.
14. Actively participate in determining consensus on final funding decisions.
15. Seek clarification from the Chair as needed any time before, during, or after the yearly grant review process.
16. Provide feedback for improvements at the end of each year's grant review process such that they can be discussed at the next RC meeting and if necessary, implemented into the following year's process and tools.

Grant Review Process

Preliminary Review

A preliminary check will be done by the CSHP Research & Education Foundation administrative staff to ensure that all components of the grant requirements are submitted.

A secondary check will be done by the Chair. **Only complete submissions will be forwarded for review.**

Pre-meeting Independent Review

Grants submissions will be reviewed independently and then discussed at a Grant Review Committee meeting. The following steps are used to adjudicate the applications:

1. Depending on the number of grants submitted, if the number of grants exceeds the number of committee members in that each committee member would be required to be the primary reviewer on more than two grant applications, each grant will be reviewed briefly by **ALL** Grant Review Committee members, including the Chair, and scored for **significance only** using the evaluation tool. If applicable, reviewers that have declared COI with grants must abstain from reviewing those grants as determined by the Chair. Grants scoring < 6/10 will not proceed to a full review. The Chair will provide feedback to the grant applicants regarding the grant application.
2. If the number of grant submissions does not exceed two grants per primary reviewer, the evaluation of significance will not be completed, and all grants will be assigned for full review.
3. Each grant will be assigned to 2 **primary reviewers**, who will be responsible for independently reviewing and scoring the overall grant in detail using the Criteria for Evaluation of Submissions tool. Primary reviewers will provide feedback to the grant applicant using the Criteria for Evaluation of Submissions form. Members not assigned as a primary reviewer must review the applications and be familiar enough with the grants to rate them on their significance and be able discuss them during the review meeting.
4. Independent primary reviews must be submitted to the Chair, one week prior to the Grant Review Committee meeting.

Meeting Review & Consensus-Based Decision-Making

1. There will be 1 teleconference meeting of the Grant Review Committee.
2. The outcome of the meeting must be a decision on funding recommendations to the Foundation re: research grant applications for the year.
3. Prior to the meeting, the Chair will have reviewed the submitted COI declarations and managed those and communicated this to all members of the Grant Review Committee. If applicable, those members having COI with specific projects will not participate in the

discussion or decisions pertaining to that specific grant. Only grants meeting ALL of the following criteria will be considered for **discussion and decision on funding**:

    a. Overall score (this excludes significance domain) ≥ 60/90

    b. Methodology score ≥ 30/40)

    c. Significance score ≥ 6/10

    d. Economic efficiency, Project Scope and Timetable score ≥ 10/15

4. Mean significance scores, submitted by the entire Grant Review Committee (excluding members with COI), will be used to rank order projects for discussion, with the most significant being discussed first.

5. Each primary reviewer will report on the grants assigned to them. The remainder of the committee will have an opportunity to ask questions and discuss after the report has been given by both primary reviewers. The primary reviewers should present the following information (guided by the evaluation criteria). Comments should focus on factors most relevant to the scoring given:

    - Preliminary overall score using the Criteria for Evaluation of Submissions standardized to an overall score out of 10 (total assigned score divided by 10)

    - Brief overview of the proposed project by section within Criteria for Evaluation of Submissions:

        o Rationale, relevance, originality description followed by total score on that section out of 25

        o Significance of the research followed by total score out of 10

        o Research hypotheses and objectives followed by total score out of 5

        o Research methodology followed by total score out of 40

        o Personnel and facilities followed by total score out of 5

        o Economic efficiency, project scope and timetable followed by total score out of 15

    - Overall impression of specific strengths of the project

    - Overall impression of specific weaknesses of the project

    - Overall impression of likelihood of completion and knowledge translation (which would include publication)

6. After discussion, the 2 primary reviewers will then assign a final **overall excellence score** out of **10**. Primary reviewers are free to change their scores based on the committee discussion. A **single** score will be reached by consensus by the primary reviewers. If a consensus score cannot be reached by the 2 primary reviewers, the Chair will assign a score. At that point, each Grant Review Committee member will be asked by the Chair:

    a. Can you live with this overall excellence scoring decision?

7. A simple majority on the aforementioned question will be used to ratify the score. If the Committee cannot ratify the score, then a revised score will be proposed by any Committee member with justification and the same ratification process will be performed until agreement on the final overall score is determined.

8. A budget amount to be funded will then be determined at this time with full justification provided to support the decision. The recommended funding amount is the decision of the Grant Review Committee and may deviate from the requested amount.
9. Once all the grants eligible for discussion are discussed and assigned a final overall excellence score out of 10, they will be ranked in order of highest score to lowest score.
10. Funding will be granted in order of scores until all monies are granted.

Communication of Results of Grant Review Process

The Chair will collate the results and provide a report with funding recommendations to the Foundation.

Special Note to Applicants

The applicant must not change their objectives, design or methods outlined in their submitted protocol after a Committee decision has been made with respect to funding. It is the responsibility of the Principal Investigator to determine whether they can complete their project, as submitted, with the granted funds. If the answer to that question is no, then they must decline receipt of the funds.

If there are any questions about this process, please contact the CSHP Foundation administrator and they will provide guidance or will advise you to contact the Chair of the Research Committee.