



JOINT-PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE 2015-2016

MANDATE

The mandate of the Canadian Foundation of Dental Hygiene Research and Education (CFDHRE) and the Canadian Dental Assistants' Association Joint-Peer Review Committee is to review grant applications submitted by applicants specifically for the CFDHRE & CDAA Joint Grant. The overarching principles inherent in the allocation of the funds in this joint research grant competition are excellence, equity of opportunity and due diligence in the use of the funds.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The Committee members will:

- Undertake a timely, transparent, fair, objective and thorough process for review of eligible applications
- Complete a conflict of interest statement for each grant application
- Participate in a conference call to reach consensus on the award selection

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The joint-peer review committee will be established for the CFDHRE and CDAA Joint Grant award. The Joint-Peer Review Committee will consist of a minimum of 3 members, who will possess a minimum of a Master's degree in one's respective professional discipline or related field. The goal is to have representation from Dental Hygiene, Dental Assisting and Audiology, if possible, for the review. All dental hygiene members of the peer review committee must be CDHA members. Previous experience reviewing research proposals or conference abstracts is considered an asset.

Committee members will be selected for their breadth of knowledge about research and their maturity of judgment. Maturity of judgment includes three factors:

- a sense of responsibility in decision making
- the ability to consider different view points
- reasoning and the ability to evaluate the applications

The CFDHRE Program Director will serve as Chair of the committee in order to oversee and ensure the integrity, consistency and quality of the peer review process.

Prospective reviewers are requested to submit their CV including a list of their published research within the last 10 years and an indication of their expertise in qualitative, quantitative and/or mixed methods research methodologies. Reviewers will be selected to participate on the committee for the

duration of this review process only, which is anticipated to begin in early November through to mid-December 2015.

SCOPE AND MAGNITUDE OF THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS¹

Proposal review processes are described by CIHR as follows:

The process of peer review consists of a system of expert review of research/scientific work by peers. It is often defined as the process of reviewing and deciding the merit of research proposals submitted for funding. The peer review process is more than a mechanism for allocating funds and judgment of merit. It is a fundamental component of the norms of higher education. It is also a process by which faculty are evaluated and promoted. It is an essential element in the scientific process by which knowledge is developed and judged to be accurate. It is the mechanism of scientific self-regulation, a method used to ensure appropriateness of research procedures, and to evaluate the scientific merit and plausibility of research results. Proponents of peer review assert that the process of peer review enhances the progress of science and is a key mechanism through which the best science is attained.

REVIEW PROCESS

Step 1: Internal Relevancy Review

The CFDHRE Program Director will review the applications to ensure that the applicant is eligible to apply and that her/his organizational objectives are aligned with those of the Foundation and this joint grant.

This review will also ensure the completeness of the application. The proposals will be screened against the requirements in the Program Guidelines and the Grant Application Form. If a missing document or item appears to be an administrative error, the CFDHRE may notify the applicant that they have 48 hours to correct the omission. Applicants will not be notified of the review outcome until the entire review process has been completed. Applicants will be notified in writing.

Step 2: External Review Process

Prior to the review process, reviewers will disclose any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest with the applications being reviewed as specified in the Conflict of Interest Guidelines below. No Joint-Peer Review Committee member with a conflict of interest may participate in the review of a proposal.

Each Joint-Peer Review Committee member will complete a Reviewers' Assessment Form for each application assigned to him/her. Electronic versions of the review form are to be forwarded electronically to the CFDHRE Program Director at foundation@cfdhre.ca.

Step 3: Phone Conference

Subsequent to individually completing the Assessment Forms for assigned applications, Joint-Peer Reviewers will participate in a conference call to reach consensus on the reviews. During the phone conference the committee responsibilities will include:

- Discuss their scores and evaluations of the proposals
- Reach consensus on the ratings for the proposals
- Rank the proposals in order of priority
- Recommend a budget sufficient to support the proposed research if the application is approved

¹ CIHR. First Report on Peer Review Innovations. CIHR, June 2005 Cited March 11, 2008
[<http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/29401.html>]

Step 4: Feedback on Committee's Effectiveness and the Review Process

In order to maintain an effective and high quality peer review process, Joint-Peer Review Committee members are encouraged to provide feedback on the committee's effectiveness in the review process. This information provides an opportunity for the Program Director to address any concerns of the committee members and improve the process overall for future grants.

PRINCIPLES OF PEER REVIEW

Confidentiality

Integrity of the joint-peer review process depends on the principles of confidentiality. All information contained in applications, reviewer reports, and committee discussions is *strictly confidential*. Applicants must not contact committee members, regarding the status of their applications or ratings. All requests for information on an application or a reviewer report should be referred to CFDHRE Program Director.

All materials related to the review process provided to peer review committee members must be stored in a secure manner to prevent unauthorized access. When they are no longer required, all material related to the peer review must be destroyed using a secure method or returned to CFDHRE for destruction.

Fairness

Success of the peer review process is dependent upon committee members to be fair and reasonable, to exercise rigorous scientific judgment and to understand and take into account in a balanced way the particular context of each application. The reviewer should take care not to make comments that could be misconstrued or may be inappropriate. Conversely, a constructive review, which includes helping the applicant by pointing out deficiencies that could be repaired in future submissions, will help to convince a disappointed applicant that you provided a fair assessment of the proposal.

Conflict of Interest Guidelines

The CFDHRE will strive to ensure that its decisions are fair and objective, and that they are seen as such. No proposal reviewer with a real, potential or apparent conflict of interest may participate in the review of a proposal.

Conflict of interest occurs whenever a proposal reviewer:

- is the Project Leader or a Co-Investigator on the proposal;
- is in a position to gain or lose financially from the outcome of the project;
- is a relative or close personal friend of the Project Leader on the proposal;
- has had long-standing scientific or personal differences with the Project Leader on the proposal;
- has collaborated, published or jointly applied for funding with the applicant within the last 3 years;

- has made public statements that could be perceived as impairing one's ability to address an issue in an impartial and objective manner;
- feels for any reason, that she/he cannot provide an objective review of the proposal.

Any proposal reviewer who has such a conflict in regard to a proposal must declare a conflict of interest. It is the reviewer's ongoing responsibility to inform the CFDHRE of potential conflict of interest situations in which one may be involved so that the issue can be addressed in a preventive manner. It is important that one does so to protect the integrity of the review process and one's own reputation. Note also that disclosures are treated in confidence. In case of doubt, disclosure is the best protection. Reviewers will complete one conflict of interest form for each grant application. See Appendix A for the form.

Revised September 29, 2015.

Appendix A

Conflict of Interest Form

Please complete one conflict of interest form for each grant application that you will be reviewing.

Project title: _____

Name(s) of applicant(s): _____

I have reviewed my current activities and those of recent years, particularly as they relate to the **CFDHRE Conflict of Interest Guidelines**. I have also considered the activities of my spouse and immediate family members in so far as they could be viewed to affect my impartiality.

I hereby certify that I am not in a position of real, potential or apparent conflict of interest except as disclosed herein: _____

Yes there is a conflict of interest and I will not review the grant application.

Name of Review Team Member: _____

(Electronic) Signature of Review Member: _____ Date: _____