B4b: Additional Reasons for Implementing Modular Grants
(16.6% said yes, there are additional reasons for implementing modular grants)

Main Themes
- Focus reviewers on the science
- Reduce study section meeting time; speed up the review process; simplify the review process
- Reduce administrative burden on NIH staff

E2b: Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond $250K
(Of those that had a preference, 60.8% said they would prefer the limit to be higher than $250,000)

Main Themes:
- Cost of research has increased since the implementation of modular grants (particularly salary costs and costs for graduate students, post docs, and their tuition)
- More collaboration would take place (since collaborator's indirect costs are currently included in $250,000 limit)
- Budget cuts reduce the award below $250,000 (therefore, the limit should be raised so that the award is actually $250,000)
- Different types of research could be accommodated using the modular format, such as clinical trials, projects involving human subjects, and studies involving large animals or transgenic animals
- Why not raise the limit? Why is it necessary at all?

Additional Comments:
- The increase need not be a lot – $275,000 to $300,000 would be sufficient
- Modular grants should increase every 5 years to account for inflation
- An alternative to raising the limit might be to remove subcontractor indirect costs from the applicant's direct costs
- Research gets tailored to the modular budget; feel obligated to stay within the $250,000 limit since grants have a better chance of being funded

E2b: Keep Modular Grant Limit at $250K
(Of those that had a preference, 39.2% said they would prefer that the limit <u>not</u> be higher than $250,000)

Main Themes:
- A higher limit would lead to fewer grant awards
- The current limit is reasonable and sufficient for most types of research; investigators can always submit a nonmodular grant if needed
- Grants larger than $250,000 should include a detailed budget justification, as this is a substantial amount of money
- Raising the limit would encourage PIs to ask for more money (since many PIs simply ask for the largest amount possible)

E3: Reasons for Liking Modular Grants
(76.9% of PIs made a comment when asked about the aspects of the modular grant application process they like)

Main Themes:

- Do not have to submit a detailed budget to NIH; allows PIs to concentrate on the science
- Do not have to write budget justification; do not have to prepare Other Support pages
- Simplicity and ease in preparing the proposal; save time in putting the proposal together; less paperwork involved; process is streamlined
- Budget will change anyway – no sense in constructing a detailed budget beforehand
- Like that salary information is confidential

Additional Comments:

- Time savings involved with the preparation of modular grants is negated because detailed budgets are required by institutions

E4: Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants
(52.3% of PIs made a comment when asked about aspects of the modular grant application process they do not like)

Main Themes:

- Institutions often require a detailed budget from investigators so there is little time saved due to modular grants; preparing a modular grant can actually add time since two types of budgets need to be prepared
- Adding subcontractor or consortium indirect costs to the project's direct costs discourages collaboration
- The $250,000 limit
- The average size of modular awards has increased, resulting in fewer grants awarded
- There is a significant problem with overlap that is not caught in the review process
- Cutting a grant by one module can greatly reduce the total amount of the award
- Uninformed budget cuts are made by reviewers
- Biosketches are required
- Unrealistic budget (same amount each year)
- Researchers at private universities and/or in urban areas are penalized by the modular grant system since the cost of doing research is more expensive in these places

F6: Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time
(47.9% of PIs made comments about Just-in-Time procedures they like)

Main Themes:

- Saves time when preparing a grant application (do not have to submit IRB approval or IACUC protocol)

- Allows PIs to concentrate on the scientific aspect of the grant and not have to deal with administrative paperwork
- If the grant is not going to get funded, obtaining approvals is a waste of everyone's time (including the IRB, IACUC, and biosafety reviewers' time)
- Information that is submitted is accurate and up to date
- Relieves stress since everything does not need to be prepared for a single deadline

Additional Comments:

- PIs often are unable to wait to submit IRB or IACUC materials until the grant is likely to be funded but at least they don't have to deal with these issues until after the application has been sent to NIH

F7: Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time

(18.9% of PIs made comments about Just-in-Time procedures they do not like)

Main Themes:

- Notice from NIH to get these materials in is too short and often results in a rush to obtain the necessary approvals
- Institutional requirements to obtain approvals earlier than NIH requires them negate the benefits of Just-in-Time
- Lack of coordination and poor document tracking at NIH means sometimes having to send the same Just-in-Time materials to several different people