



Foundation Scheme (1st Live Pilot) Application Requirements Stage 2

This document provides a summary of the application requirements for Stage 2 of the first Foundation Scheme Live Pilot. While the application content is not expected to change, the application for this competition will be completed through ResearchNet, and may look different.

Administrative, Peer Review and Consent Information

As with other CIHR programs, applicants will be required to include specific applicant, peer review and consent information.

1. Application Information

The applicant's/applicants' information about the Program Leader(s) such as name, CIHR PIN, and institution will be brought forward from Stage 1. Basic information such as program title, administrative details, and descriptors will also be brought forward.

At Stage 2, the applicant(s) will also be asked to include the names of Individuals participating as Program Experts (e.g., researchers, knowledge-users, trainees).

The Program Leader(s) will attach the **Foundation Scheme CV(s)** (completed through the Canadian Common CV (CCV) – requirements can be found in [Appendix 1](#)). No CVs for Program Experts will be required.

2. Peer Review Administration

The applicant(s) will update information that will be used for the purpose of peer review administration, such as suggested reviewers, and reviewers to exclude, for the submitted application.

3. Preview and Consent

The applicant(s) will be able to preview the various sections of their application as they are completed. The full Stage 2 application and CV(s) can also be previewed once complete.

The applicant(s) will be required to consent to the conditions of funding and the sharing of information prior to submitting the application. Applications must be approved by the applicant's institution prior to submission.



Overview – General Instructions

The Foundation Scheme is supported by a three-stage competition and review process that focuses reviewer attention on specific structured review criteria. There are two components being considered within **Stage 2** of the Foundation scheme: **Quality of the Program** and **Quality of the Expertise, Experience and Resources**.

- **Quality of the Program** focuses on the applicant's/applicants' ability to define and articulate the research concept and research approach.
- **Quality of the Expertise, Experience and Resources** focuses on the appropriateness of the expertise assembled to successfully complete the proposed program of research, the appropriateness of the applicant's/applicants' mentorship and training plans, and the quality of the support environment.

The criteria will be assessed by peer reviewers familiar with the applicant's/applicants' field(s) of research. Peer reviewers will be instructed to take the applicant/applicants' career stage and field of research into consideration.

The substantive content for the application will be divided into three sections.

Section 1 – Summary

The first section will include a summary of the application. The specific requirements are outlined below.

1. Summary - (*approx. 1 page*)

The applicant(s) will be asked to summarize their program of research, making sure to address the following points:

- The overarching direction of the program of research, including the major questions or issues to be addressed;
- How the anticipated results of the research program will advance knowledge, health care, health systems, and/or health outcomes in the short-term and in the long-term (as appropriate);
- The nature of the core expertise (disciplinary, professional, or methodological) being assembled to accomplish the proposed program of research; and
- A description of the proposed mentoring and training activities that will occur throughout the funded program of research.

Section 2: Quality of the Program (40%)

The second section will include the information required to assess the Quality of the Program. This section is divided into two subsections (a) Research Concept and (b) Research Approach. The specific requirements for each subsection are outlined below.



2A. Research Concept (20%) - (approx. 3 pages)

The applicant(s) will be asked to articulate the program of research by outlining the goal, objective(s), and potential impact(s) of the proposed program.

Applicants are encouraged to reflect upon the questions being asked of reviewers when completing this subsection. These include:

- *Are the goal and objectives of the proposed program well-defined and well-articulated?*
- *Is there conceptual coherence within the program of research?*
- *Are the potential program outputs significant? Are they likely to significantly advance health-related knowledge and/or its translation into improved health care, health systems and/or health outcomes?*

2B. Research Approach (20%) - (approx. 2 pages)

The applicant(s) will be asked to articulate their research approach including:

- Potential challenges to the approach
- Mitigation strategies that will be employed to overcome those challenges
- How progress and success will be measured

The applicant(s) will not be expected to provide extensive details on established methodologies; however, they should appropriately describe novel/innovative approaches.

Foundation grants are meant to be flexible in order to allow the Program Leader(s) an opportunity to innovate, and explore new lines of inquiry. A detailed research design and project-by-project plan for each thematically-linked project in the program of research is not expected.

Applicants are encouraged to reflect upon the questions being asked of reviewers when completing this subsection. These include:

- *Is the research approach appropriate to deliver on the proposed program objectives?*
- *Does the approach allow for flexibility in direction as the program evolves?*
- *Does the approach include a high-level description of how progress and success will be measured?*
- *Does the approach include a plan for identifying potential challenges and applying appropriate mitigation strategies?*

Section 3: Quality of the Expertise, Experience, and Resources (60%)

The third section will include information required to assess the Quality of the Expertise, Experience and Resources. This section is divided into three subsections: (a) Expertise, (b) Mentorship and Training, and (c) Quality of the Support Environment. The specific requirements for each subsection are outlined below.

The Foundation Scheme CV(s) (Appendix 1) will also be used as part of this assessment.



3A. Expertise (20%) - (approx. 3 pages)

The applicant(s) will be asked to outline the collective expertise (disciplinary, professional or methodological) being assembled, and how it is appropriate to ensure the delivery of the objectives of the proposed research program. This includes the expertise and experience of the proposed Program Leader(s), as well as Program Expert(s) (e.g., researchers, technicians, knowledge-users, partners, patients and trainees, etc.).

It is expected that the Program Experts may evolve over the duration of the grant, based on the needs of the proposed program.

Applicants are encouraged to reflect upon the questions being asked of reviewers when completing this subsection. These include:

- *Does the applicant(s) have the appropriate expertise and relevant experience to lead and manage the proposed program of research, considering its objectives and scope?*
- *Is there an appropriate complement and level of engagement and/or commitment from key Program Expert(s)?*

3B. Mentorship and Training (20%) - (approx. 2 pages)

The applicant(s) will be asked to articulate a Mentorship and Training Plan by outlining the rationale for the proposed training approach, potential challenges of the training/mentorship plan, as well as how progress and success will be measured.

Applicants are encouraged to reflect upon the questions being asked of reviewers when completing this subsection. These include:

- *Does the research program include a comprehensive mentorship and training plan for building capacity and positioning students, trainees, knowledge users, emerging scholars, and/or new/early career investigators for successful research careers and/or other career paths in non-academic health-related fields?*
- *Does the proposed plan demonstrate an appropriate and innovative approach for meeting its objectives in relation to the program of research and the research field?*
- *Does the plan include a strategy for identifying and mitigating potential challenges?*

3C. Quality of Support Environment (20%) - (approx. 1 page)

The applicant(s) will be asked to outline the resources that they currently have in place to ensure the successful delivery of the research program objectives.

Applicants are encouraged to reflect upon the questions being asked of reviewers when completing this subsection. This includes:

- *Is the described environment(s) appropriate to enable the conduct of the program of research, and to manage and deliver on the objectives and key components of the proposed research*



program (e.g., research, knowledge translation, mentoring/training) through the provision of, or access to, the required infrastructure, such as:

- *Physical infrastructure (and/or other types of infrastructure such as consortia professional networks etc.)*
- *Support personnel*
- *Equipment*
- *Specialized facilities*
- *Supplies*

Budget Request - (approx. ½ page)

The applicant(s) will be asked to provide information regarding the budget request to support the proposed program of research, including the total amount requested and the amount requested per annum.

The applicant(s) will demonstrate that the amount requested is appropriate to support the proposed program of research, making sure to highlight funding history and/or any other sources of funding as appropriate.

While the amount requested will not be factored into the scientific assessment of the application, reviewers will be asked to make a recommendation on the appropriateness of the funding request.

Applicants are encouraged to reflect upon the questions being asked of reviewers when completing this subsection. These include:

- *Is the requested budget appropriate to support the proposed program of research? Is it realistic and well-justified?*
- *If the request is significantly higher than the applicants historical grant levels, is it appropriately justified? Note: Justifications for CIHR funding to replace other on-going sources of funding (e.g., health charity, provincial funding agency) are not acceptable.*