

## **DFCM INVESTIGATOR AWARDS**

### **ANNUAL REVIEW CRITERIA**

**Final Revised June 6, 2013**

#### **1.0 Introduction**

This document describes the criteria used in annual and five year reviews of those who hold Department of Family and Community Medicine (DFCM) Investigator Awards:

- **DFCM Clinician Scientist Award** (those with  $\geq 50\%$  protected research time)
- **DFCM Clinician Investigator Award** (those with  $< 50\%$  protected research time)
- **DFCM New Investigator Award** (maximum 3 year award)
- **DFCM Graduate Research Studies Award (previously called DFCM Fellowship Award)** (maximum of 2 years when completing a Masters degree or 5 years for a PhD)

The DFCM Investigator Awards are competitive research awards designed to support research activities and build research capacity in the DFCM. Once achieved by a member of the DFCM, continued funding through these awards is not guaranteed, but is contingent on:

- availability of funds
- quality and number of competitors
- continued eligibility of the applicant
- success at annual reviews of the applicant

To remain eligible for continued funding, DFCM Investigator Award recipients must hold an academic appointment or equivalent in the DFCM, and receive enhanced matched salary support. Annual reviews are used to determine continuing eligibility and funding under these awards. To succeed in annual reviews, award recipients must show that they have made contributions to the DFCM, and have maintained research productivity to levels of expectation that vary according to award category, described below.

The annual review criteria outlined below were revised and approved by the Research Executive Committee (REC) in March 2013 and will be the basis of future annual reviews and five year reviews scheduled in for 2014. Prior to dissemination, all DFCM Investigator Award recipients were sent a copy of the revised annual review criteria, for them to review.

#### **1.1 Process for Disseminating the Revised Annual Review Criteria**

The Vice-Chair, Research and/or the Associate Director of the Research Program will go over this information with each of the DFCM Investigator Award recipients during their annual review meetings in 2013. These criteria will also be included with the 2013 annual review letters which will be sent from the Vice-Chair, Research to each award recipient and copied to their respective Family Medicine Chief/Division Director after the annual review. Award recipients must return within 30 days a signed copy of the Revised Annual Review Criteria. The revised annual review criteria will also be posted on the DFCM website and presented at both the DFCM Research Rounds and the DFCM Executive Committee.

## **1.2 Annual Review Process**

Award recipients will submit, in advance, information to be assessed during annual review meetings with the DFCM Vice-Chair, Research and/or the Associate Director of the Research Program. Concerns identified during these annual review meetings will be taken to the DFCM Research Executive Committee (REC) for final peer review. If their file is taken to the REC, the DFCM Investigator Award recipient will be notified in advance and given the opportunity to provide additional information. There is no appeal following the decision by the REC. If the REC's decision is to terminate funding, funds will continue for 3 months from the decision date.

## **1.3 Five Year Review Process**

The next five year reviews will be scheduled for early 2015 and will cover the period January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2014. Award recipients will submit, in advance, information to be assessed during the five year review meeting with the DFCM Vice-Chair, Research, the Associate Director of the Research Program (or their designates to ensure that there are at least two DFCM internal reviewers) and at least one reviewer external to the DFCM. Concerns identified during the five year review will be taken to the DFCM Research Executive Committee (REC) for final peer review. If their file is taken to the REC, the DFCM Investigator Award recipient will be notified in advance and given the opportunity to provide additional information. There is no appeal following the decision by the REC. If the REC's decision is to terminate funding, funds will continue for 3 months from the decision date.

## 2.0 ANNUAL REVIEW CRITERIA FOR CLINICIAN SCIENTISTS

### 2.1 Required Contributions to the DFCM

- **Evidence of Mentorship:**
  - Must have a formal mentorship role in support of one or more DFCM faculty members.
    - *Note: All DFCM Investigator Award recipients must also have one or more formal research mentors if they have been a researcher for less than 10 years, after which the need for having a mentor will be evaluated at the time of the annual reviews.*
- **Participation in DFCM Activities:**
  - Must attend more than 50% of DFCM Research Rounds plus participate in other DFCM activities (e.g. Faculty Retreat & Walter Rosser Academic Day) in each calendar year and present at one of these activities at least once in a three year period.
- **Evidence of Research Collaboration:**
  - Must show evidence of a meaningful collaborative research relationship (e.g. as shown by grants and publications) with other senior researchers in an established research environment or team.
    - *Note: Although the intent of this requirement is to collaborate with other DFCM researchers, it is recognized that some collaborative research relationships can take place with non DFCM researchers.*
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Family Medicine Teaching Units:**
  - Must be associated with one of the DFCM's family medicine teaching units and show evidence of participation in their committee meetings, discussion groups and rounds.
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Research Program:**
  - Must take part in the internal grant application review process, reviewing applications for peer-reviewed funding and applications for career awards.
  - Must take part in rating peer reviewed research publications of DFCM faculty for the annual DFCM "Outstanding Peer Reviewed Publication" awards.
- **Description of potential impact:**
  - Must provide a brief description in the Annual Review Form that indicates how the protected research time has made an impact on clinical practice, policy, teaching, research etc. at the local, national and/or international levels.

### 2.2 Required Research Productivity

- **Peer Reviewed Publications:**
  - The expectation is that the majority of peer reviewed publications will be original research (including systematic reviews). Editorials, letters, observations, views, debates, reviews, etc. are not considered original research for the purpose of this research productivity review.
  - Clinician Scientists with 60% protected research time are expected to have at least 3 peer reviewed publications in most calendar years (an average of at least 9 peer reviewed publications over the 3 year period January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2015). The next 3 year period will begin January 1, 2016 (or for new award recipients, the year in which they first received the award).
  - Of the above 9 peer reviewed publications, 3 are expected to be either as first author or senior author.

- Clinician Scientists with more than or less than 60% protected research time are expected to have the number of peer reviewed publications proportional to their amount of protected research time. For example, those with 80% protected research time would be expected to have at least 4 peer reviewed publications in most calendar years (an average of at least 12 peer reviewed publications over the 3 calendar years, 4 of which are expected to be either as first author or senior author).
  - *Note: Clinician Scientists must also clearly indicate in their CVs their roles on all publications.*
- **Peer Reviewed Grants:**
  - Clinician Scientists are expected to hold at least 1 active peer reviewed grant as PI or Co-PI in most calendar years. For those who do not, they must provide evidence that they have been actively applying for one. The goal is that they should hold at least 1 peer reviewed grant as PI or Co-PI over the 3 year period January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2015. The next 3 year period will begin January 1, 2016 (or for new award recipients, the year in which they first received the award).
    - *Note: Individual project PIs (with dedicated budgets) on team grants are considered PIs.*
  - In addition to holding at least 1 active grant as PI or Co-PI, a Clinician Scientist must hold at least 1 other peer reviewed grant as either PI, Co-PI or Co-I *at all times* or have at least 1 peer reviewed grant application under review in each calendar year as either PI, Co-PI, or Co-I.
    - *Note: Clinician Scientists must also clearly indicate in their CVs their roles on all grants.*
- **Peer Reviewed Presentations:**
  - Clinician Scientists must present or co-present, or have submitted an application as PI/Co-PI to present their peer reviewed research findings at one or more National or International peer reviewed conferences each calendar year (presenting or co-presenting at least once in a three year period). The presentation may take the form of an oral presentation, poster presentation or workshop.
    - *Note: Clinician Scientists must also clearly indicate in their CVs their roles on all peer reviewed presentations and specify the type (oral presentation, poster presentation, workshop) and audience (Local, National, International).*
- **Career Awards:**
  - All Clinician Scientists must apply for available relevant career awards appropriate to their stage of career.
- **Acknowledgments:**
  - Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award in all publications and presentations, where possible.
  - Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award on their CV.
  - Must acknowledge their affiliation with the DFCM in all publications and presentations. The following formats have been recommended:
    - **Short form** – Hospital/Research Institute/Academic Department, University of Toronto, Street Address
    - **Long form** – Research Institute/Clinical Program, Hospital (and where appropriate Corporation e.g. UHN), Academic Department, University of Toronto, Street Address

### 3.0 ANNUAL REVIEW CRITERIA FOR CLINICIAN INVESTIGATORS

#### 3.1 Required Contributions to the DFCM

- **Evidence of Mentorship:**
  - Must have a formal mentorship role in support of one or more DFCM faculty members.
    - *Note: All DFCM Investigator Award holders must also have one or more formal research mentors if they have been a researcher for less than 10 years, after which the need for having a mentor will be evaluated at the time of the annual reviews.*
- **Participation in DFCM Activities:**
  - Must attend more than 50% of DFCM Research Rounds plus participate in other DFCM activities (e.g. Faculty Retreat & Walter Rosser Academic Day) in each calendar year and present at one of these activities at least once in a three year period.
- **Evidence of Research Collaboration:**
  - Must show evidence of a meaningful collaborative research relationship (e.g. as shown by grants and publications) with senior researchers in an established research environment or team.
    - *Note: Although the intent of this requirement is to collaborate with other DFCM researchers, it is recognized that some collaborative research relationships can take place with non DFCM researchers.*
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Family Medicine Teaching Units:**
  - Must be associated with one of the DFCM's family medicine teaching units and show evidence of participation in their committee meetings, discussion groups and rounds.
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Research Program:**
  - Depending on stage of career, content and methodological expertise, may be required to take part in the internal grant application review process, reviewing applications for peer-reviewed funding and applications for career awards.
  - Must take part in rating peer reviewed research publications of DFCM faculty for the annual DFCM "Outstanding Peer Reviewed Publication" awards.
- **Description of potential impact:**
  - Must provide a brief description in the Annual Review Form that indicates how the protected research time has made an impact on clinical practice, policy, teaching, research etc. at the local, national and/or international levels.

#### 3.2 Required Research Productivity

- **Peer Reviewed Publications:**
  - The expectation is that the majority of peer reviewed publications will be original research (including systematic reviews). Editorials, letters, observations, views, debates, reviews, etc. are not considered original research for the purpose of this research productivity review.
  - Clinician Investigators with 40% protected research time are expected to have at least 2 peer reviewed publications in most calendar years (an average of at least 6 peer reviewed publications over the 3 year period January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2015). The next 3 year period will begin January 1, 2016 (or for new award recipients, the year in which they first received the award).

- Clinician Investigators with more than or less than 40% protected research time are expected to have the number of peer reviewed publications proportional to their amount of protected research time. For example, those with 20% protected research time would be expected to have at least 1 peer reviewed publication in most calendar years (an average of at least 3 peer reviewed publications over the 3 calendar years).
  - *Note: Clinician Investigators must also clearly indicate in their CVs their roles on all publications.*
- **Peer Reviewed Grants:**
  - A Clinician Investigator must hold at least one active peer reviewed grant as a PI, Co-PI or Co-Investigator in each calendar year and submit grant applications for peer-reviewed grants as needed to ensure that at least one grant is held at all times as PI, Co-PI or Co-Investigator.
    - *Note: Clinician Investigators must also clearly indicate in their CVs their roles on all grants.*
- **Peer Reviewed Presentations:**
  - Clinician Investigators must present, co-present, or be a co-author or have submitted an application as PI, Co-PI, Co-I to present their peer reviewed research findings at one or more Local, National or International peer-reviewed conferences each calendar year (presenting or co-presenting at least once in a three year period). The presentation may take the form of an oral presentation, poster presentation or workshop.
    - *Note: Clinician Investigators must also clearly indicate in their CVs their roles on all peer reviewed presentations and specify the type (oral presentation, poster presentation, workshop) and audience (Local, National, International).*
- **Career Awards:**
  - All Clinician Investigators must apply for available relevant career awards appropriate to their stage of career.
- **Acknowledgments:**
  - Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award in all publications and presentations, where possible.
  - Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award on their CV.
  - Must acknowledge their affiliation with the DFCM in all publications and presentations. The following formats have been recommended:
    - **Short form** – Hospital/Research Institute/Academic Department, University of Toronto, Street Address
    - **Long form** – Research Institute/Clinical Program, Hospital (and where appropriate Corporation e.g. UHN), Academic Department, University of Toronto, Street Address

#### 4.0 ANNUAL REVIEW CRITERIA FOR NEW INVESTIGATORS

##### 4.1 Required Contributions to the DFCM

- **Evidence of Mentorship:**
  - Must have a formal mentorship role in support of one or more DFCM faculty members.
    - *Note: All DFCM Investigator Award holders must also have one or more formal research mentors if they have been a researcher for less than 10 years, after which the need for having a mentor will be evaluated at the time of the annual reviews.*
- **Participation in DFCM Activities:**
  - Must attend more than 50% of DFCM Research Rounds plus participate in other DFCM activities (e.g. Faculty Retreat & Walter Rosser Academic Day) in each calendar year and present at one of these activities at least once in a three year period.
- **Evidence of Research Collaboration:**
  - Must show evidence of a meaningful collaborative research relationship (e.g. as shown by grants and publications) with senior researchers in an established research environment or team.
    - *Note: Although the intent of this requirement is to collaborate with other DFCM researchers, it is recognized that some collaborative research relationships can take place with non DFCM researchers.*
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Family Medicine Teaching Units:**
  - Must be associated with one of the DFCM's family medicine teaching units and show evidence of participation in their committee meetings, discussion groups and rounds.
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Research Program:**
  - Depending on stage of career, content and methodological expertise, may be required to take part in the internal grant application review process, reviewing applications for peer-reviewed funding and applications for career awards.
  - Must take part in rating peer reviewed research publications of DFCM faculty for the annual DFCM "Outstanding Peer Reviewed Publication" awards.
- **Description of potential impact:**
  - Must provide a brief description in the Annual Review Form that indicates how the protected research time has made an impact on clinical practice, policy, teaching, research etc. at the local, national and/or international levels.

##### 4.2 Required Research Productivity

- **Peer Reviewed Publications:**
  - The expectation is that the majority of peer reviewed publications will be original research (including systematic reviews). Editorials, letters, observations, views, debates, reviews, etc. are not considered original research for the purpose of this research productivity review.
  - New Investigators with 40% protected research time are expected to have at least 2 peer reviewed publications in most calendar years (an average of at least 6 peer reviewed publications over the 3 year period January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2015. The next 3 year period will begin January 1, 2016 (or for new award recipients, the year in which they first received the award).

- New Investigators with more than or less than 40% protected research time are expected to have the number of peer reviewed publications proportional to their amount of protected research time. For example, those with 20% protected research time would be expected to have at least 1 peer reviewed publication in most calendar years (an average of at least 3 peer reviewed publications over the 3 calendar years).
  - *Note: New Investigators must also clearly indicate in their CVs their roles on all publications.*
- **Peer Reviewed Grants:**
  - A New Investigator must hold at least one active peer reviewed grant as a PI, Co-PI or Co-Investigator in each calendar year and submit grant applications for peer-reviewed grants as needed to ensure that at least one grant is held at all times as PI, Co-PI or Co-Investigator.
    - *Note: New Investigators must also clearly indicate in their CVs their roles on all grants.*
- **Peer Reviewed Presentations:**
  - New Investigators must present, co-present, or be a co-author or have submitted an application as PI, Co-PI, Co-I to present their peer reviewed research findings at one or more Local, National or International peer-reviewed conferences each calendar year (presenting or co-presenting at least once in a three year period). The presentation may take the form of an oral presentation, poster presentation or workshop.
    - *Note: New Investigators must also clearly indicate in their CVs their roles on all peer reviewed presentations and specify the type (oral presentation, poster presentation, workshop) and audience (Local, National, International).*
- **Career Awards:**
  - All New Investigators must apply for available relevant career awards appropriate to their stage of career.
- **Acknowledgments:**
  - Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award in all publications and presentations, where possible.
  - Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award on their CV.
  - Must acknowledge their affiliation with the DFCM in all publications and presentations. The following formats have been recommended:
    - **Short form** – Hospital/Research Institute/Academic Department, University of Toronto, Street Address
    - **Long form** – Research Institute/Clinical Program, Hospital (and where appropriate Corporation e.g. UHN), Academic Department, University of Toronto, Street Address



## 5.0 ANNUAL REVIEW CRITERIA FOR GRADUATE RESEARCH STUDIES

### 5.1 Required Contributions to the DFCM

- **Participation in DFCM Activities:**
  - Must attend more than 50% of DFCM Research Rounds plus participate in other DFCM activities (e.g. Faculty Retreat & Walter Rosser Academic Day) in each calendar year and present at one of these activities at least once in a three year period.
- **Evidence of Research Collaboration:**
  - Must show evidence of a meaningful collaborative research relationship (e.g. as shown by grants and publications) with senior researchers in an established research environment or team.
    - *Note: Although the intent of this requirement is to collaborate with other DFCM researchers, it is recognized that some collaborative research relationships can take place with non DFCM researchers.*
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Family Medicine Teaching Units:**
  - Must be associated with one of the DFCM's family medicine teaching units and show evidence of participation in their committee meetings, discussion groups and rounds.
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Research Program:**
  - Depending on stage of career, content and methodological expertise, may be required to take part in the internal grant application review process, reviewing applications for peer-reviewed funding and applications for career awards.
  - Must take part in rating peer reviewed research publications of DFCM faculty for the annual DFCM "Outstanding Peer Reviewed Publication" awards.

### 5.2 Required Academic Productivity

- **Successful Progression through Degree Program:**
  - Must provide evidence (e.g. letters from their academic and thesis supervisors) showing successful progression through their degree program (e.g. course work, thesis proposal acceptance, thesis defense date) and a proposed timeline for completion.
- **Peer Reviewed Presentations:**
  - Must present, co-present, or be a co-author or have submitted an application as PI, Co-PI, Co-I to present their peer reviewed research findings at one or more Local, National or International peer-reviewed conferences each calendar year (presenting or co-presenting at least once in a three year period). The presentation may take the form of an oral presentation, poster presentation or workshop.
    - *Note: Graduate Research Studies award recipients must also clearly indicate in their CVs their roles on all peer reviewed presentations and specify the type (oral presentation, poster presentation, workshop) and audience (Local, National, International).*
- **Career Awards:**
  - Must apply for available relevant career awards appropriate to their stage of career.
- **Acknowledgments:**
  - Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award in all publications and presentations, where possible.
  - Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award on their CV.

- Must acknowledge their affiliation with the DFCM in all publications and presentations. The following formats have been recommended:
  - **Short form** – Hospital/Research Institute/Academic Department, University of Toronto, Street Address
  - **Long form** – Research Institute/Clinical Program, Hospital (and where appropriate Corporation e.g. UHN), Academic Department, University of Toronto, Street Address