A1. Since 1999, have you reviewed a modular grant application?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	497	100.0	100.0	100.0

A1b. Approximately what percentage of the grants have been modular?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	1	.2	.2	.2
	5	4	.8	.8	1.0
	9	1	.2	.2	1.2
	10	6	1.2	1.2	2.4
	15	3	.6	.6	3.0
	20	11	2.2	2.2	5.2
	25	19	3.8	3.8	9.1
	30	14	2.8	2.8	11.9
	33	1	.2	.2	12.1
	35	3	.6	.6	12.7
	40	3	.6	.6	13.3
	50	35	7.0	7.0	20.3
	60	17	3.4	3.4	23.7
	65	5	1.0	1.0	24.7
	66	2	.4	.4	25.2
	67	1	.2	.2	25.4
	70	13	2.6	2.6	28.0
	75	28	5.6	5.6	33.6
	80	60	12.1	12.1	45.7
	85	16	3.2	3.2	48.9
	90	140	28.2	28.2	77.1
	95	71	14.3	14.3	91.3
	97	2	.4	.4	91.8
	98	7	1.4	1.4	93.2
	99	10	2.0	2.0	95.2
	100	24	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	497	100.0	100.0	

A1b Collapsed - Percentage of grants that were modular

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 50%	66	13.3	13.3	13.3
	50 to 74%	73	14.7	14.7	28.0
	75 to 89%	104	20.9	20.9	48.9
	90%	140	28.2	28.2	77.1
	More than 90%	114	22.9	22.9	100.0
	Total	497	100.0	100.0	

Statistics

A1b. Approximately what percentage of the grants have been modular?

N	Valid	497
	Missing	0
Median		90.00

Peer Reviewers

A2. How many peer review panels have you ever attended?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	.2	.2	.2
	2	2	.4	.4	.6
	3	7	1.4	1.4	2.0
	4	6	1.2	1.2	3.2
	5	11	2.2	2.2	5.5
	6	17	3.4	3.4	8.9
	7	12	2.4	2.4	11.3
	8	21	4.2	4.3	15.6
	9	12	2.4	2.4	18.0
	10	47	9.5	9.5	27.5
	11	12	2.4	2.4	30.0
	12	50	10.1	10.1	40.1
	13	8	1.6	1.6	41.7
	14	15	3.0	3.0	44.7
	15	60	12.1	12.1	56.9
	16	16	3.2	3.2	60.1
	17	2	.4	.4	60.5
	18	19	3.8	3.8	64.4
	19	1	.2	.2	64.6
	20	55	11.1	11.1	75.7
	21	3	.6	.6	76.3
	22	4	.8	.8	77.1
	24	6	1.2	1.2	78.3
	25	28	5.6	5.7	84.0
	27	1	.2	.2	84.2
	28	3	.6	.6	84.8
	30	26	5.2	5.3	90.1
	31	2	.4	.4	90.5
	32	2	.4	.4	90.9
	34	1	.2	.2	91.1
	35	5	1.0	1.0	92.1
	36	1	.2	.2	92.3
	39	1	.2	.2	92.5
	40	13	2.6	2.6	95.1
	42	2	.4	.4	95.5
	45	1	.2	.2	95.7
	50	12	2.4	2.4	98.2
	55	2	.4	.4	98.6
	60	1	.2	.2	98.8
	65	1	.2	.2	99.0
	75	1	.2	.2	99.2
	80	3	.6	.6	99.8
	100	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	494	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.6		
Total		497	100.0		

A2 Collapsed - Number of review panels attended

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 10	89	17.9	18.0	18.0
	10 to 14	132	26.6	26.7	44.7
	15 to 19	98	19.7	19.8	64.6
	20 to 29	100	20.1	20.2	84.8
	30 or more	75	15.1	15.2	100.0
	Total	494	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.6		
Total		497	100.0		

Statistics

A2. How many peer review panels have you ever attended?

N	Valid	494
	Missing	3
Median		15.00

A3a. Year of first review experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1970	1	.2	.2	.2
	1973	1	.2	.2	.4
	1974	3	.6	.6	1.0
	1975	2	.4	.4	1.4
	1976	2	.4	.4	1.8
	1978	1	.2	.2	2.0
	1979	3	.6	.6	2.6
	1980	7	1.4	1.4	4.0
	1981	3	.6	.6	4.7
	1982	4	.8	.8	5.5
	1983	5	1.0	1.0	6.5
	1984	14	2.8	2.8	9.3
	1985	15	3.0	3.0	12.3
	1986	9	1.8	1.8	14.2
	1987	7	1.4	1.4	15.6
	1988	13	2.6	2.6	18.2
	1989	11	2.2	2.2	20.4
	1990	30	6.0	6.1	26.5
	1991	15	3.0	3.0	29.6
	1992	24	4.8	4.9	34.4
	1993	24	4.8	4.9	39.3
	1994	24	4.8	4.9	44.1
	1995	26	5.2	5.3	49.4
	1996	29	5.8	5.9	55.3
	1997	39	7.8	7.9	63.2
	1998	35	7.0	7.1	70.2
	1999	60	12.1	12.1	82.4
	2000	36	7.2	7.3	89.7
	2001	25	5.0	5.1	94.7
	2002	17	3.4	3.4	98.2
	2003	9	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	494	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.6		
Total		497	100.0		

A3a Collapsed - Decade of first review experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1970s	13	2.6	2.6	2.6
	1980s	88	17.7	17.8	20.4
	1990s	306	61.6	61.9	82.4
	2000s	87	17.5	17.6	100.0
	Total	494	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.6		
Total		497	100.0		

A3b. Year of most recent review experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2001	2	.4	.4	.4
	2002	17	3.4	3.4	3.8
	2003	66	13.3	13.4	17.2
	2004	409	82.3	82.8	100.0
	Total	494	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.6		
Total		497	100.0		

A4. Have you ever been a Principal Investigator on a grant?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	490	98.6	99.0	99.0
	No	5	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	495	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.4		
Total		497	100.0		

A5a. Have you ever submitted a modular grant application to NIH?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	429	86.3	86.7	86.7
	No	66	13.3	13.3	100.0
	Total	495	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.4		
Total		497	100.0		

A5b. Have you ever been awarded a modular grant?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	395	79.5	92.1	92.1
	No	34	6.8	7.9	100.0
	Total	429	86.3	100.0	
Missing	System	68	13.7		
Total		497	100.0		

A6a. Have you ever submitted a nonmodular grant application to NIH?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	454	91.3	91.7	91.7
	No	41	8.2	8.3	100.0
	Total	495	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.4		
Total		497	100.0		

A6b. Have you ever been awarded a nonmodular grant?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	430	86.5	94.7	94.7
	No	24	4.8	5.3	100.0
	Total	454	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	43	8.7		
Total		497	100.0		

B1a. Knowledge of modular grants: No routine escalation for future years

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	404	81.3	81.8	81.8
	Not Clear	61	12.3	12.3	94.1
	Never Heard About	29	5.8	5.9	100.0
	Total	494	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.6		
Total		497	100.0		

B1b. Knowledge of modular grants: May request additional modules to cover unusual cost fluctuation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	387	77.9	78.7	78.7
	Not Clear	49	9.9	10.0	88.6
	Never Heard About	56	11.3	11.4	100.0
	Total	492	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.0		
Total		497	100.0		

B1c. Knowledge of modular grants: Additional narrative budget justification needed for variation in number of modules requested

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	393	79.1	79.7	79.7
	Not Clear	74	14.9	15.0	94.7
	Never Heard About	26	5.2	5.3	100.0
	Total	493	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.8		
Total		497	100.0		

B1d. Knowledge of modular grants: No Other Support form in modular grant application

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	379	76.3	77.0	77.0
	Not Clear	87	17.5	17.7	94.7
	Never Heard About	26	5.2	5.3	100.0
	Total	492	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.0		
Total		497	100.0		

B1e. Knowledge of modular grants: Narrative budget justification needed only for personnel, consortium/contractual arrangements

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	410	82.5	83.8	83.8
	Not Clear	68	13.7	13.9	97.8
	Never Heard About	11	2.2	2.2	100.0
	Total	489	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.6		
Total		497	100.0		

B1f. Knowledge of modular grants: Individual salary information is not required for personnel

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	466	93.8	94.7	94.7
	Not Clear	21	4.2	4.3	99.0
	Never Heard About	5	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	492	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.0		
Total		497	100.0		

B1g. Knowledge of modular grants: Total consortium/contractual costs need to be estimated for each year

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	244	49.1	50.0	50.0
	Not Clear	136	27.4	27.9	77.9
	Never Heard About	108	21.7	22.1	100.0
	Total	488	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.8		
Total		497	100.0		

B1h. Knowledge of modular grants: Total cost of consortium/contractual arrangement is included in requested modular direct cost total

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	380	76.5	77.6	77.6
	Not Clear	74	14.9	15.1	92.7
	Never Heard About	36	7.2	7.3	100.0
	Total	490	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.4		
Total		497	100.0		

B1i. Knowledge of modular grants: Indirect costs are not calculated on equipment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	423	85.1	86.2	86.2
	Not Clear	44	8.9	9.0	95.1
	Never Heard About	24	4.8	4.9	100.0
	Total	491	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.2		
Total		497	100.0		

B1j. Knowledge of modular grants: Biographical sketches need to be prepared for all key personnel

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	482	97.0	98.6	98.6
	Not Clear	5	1.0	1.0	99.6
	Never Heard About	2	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	489	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.6		
Total		497	100.0		

B1k. Knowledge of modular grants: Biographical sketches should include goals of current/completed research projects

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	430	86.5	87.6	87.6
	Not Clear	48	9.7	9.8	97.4
	Never Heard About	13	2.6	2.6	100.0
	Total	491	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.2		
Total		497	100.0		

B1l. Knowledge of modular grants: Modular grant awards are eligible for administrative supplements

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	232	46.7	47.3	47.3
	Not Clear	153	30.8	31.2	78.6
	Never Heard About	105	21.1	21.4	100.0
	Total	490	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.4		
Total		497	100.0		

B1m. Knowledge of modular grants: All forms for modular grant applications are available on the NIH website

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	470	94.6	95.9	95.9
	Not Clear	15	3.0	3.1	99.0
	Never Heard About	5	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	490	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.4		
Total		497	100.0		

B1n. Knowledge of modular grants: Some form pages are different for a modular grant application

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	421	84.7	86.8	86.8
	Not Clear	51	10.3	10.5	97.3
	Never Heard About	13	2.6	2.7	100.0
	Total	485	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	2.4		
Total		497	100.0		

B2a. Knowledge of peer review process: Peer reviewers can recommend modules be cut

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	465	93.6	94.9	94.9
	Not Clear	16	3.2	3.3	98.2
	Never Heard About	9	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	490	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.4		
Total		497	100.0		

B2b. Knowledge of peer review process: Peer reviewers should not recommend specific percentages be cut

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	384	77.3	78.4	78.4
	Not Clear	78	15.7	15.9	94.3
	Never Heard About	28	5.6	5.7	100.0
	Total	490	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.4		
Total		497	100.0		

B2c. Knowledge of peer review process: Peer reviewers should describe recommendations in budget section without an amount when recommending changes without determined cost reduction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clear	290	58.4	59.3	59.3
	Not Clear	145	29.2	29.7	89.0
	Never Heard About	54	10.9	11.0	100.0
	Total	489	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.6		
Total		497	100.0		

B3a. Heard of specific goals: Reduce administrative burden for peer reviewers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	422	84.9	86.3	86.3
	No	67	13.5	13.7	100.0
	Total	489	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.6		
Total		497	100.0		

B3b. Heard of specific goals: Focus efforts of peer reviewers on scientific content of the grant application

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	428	86.1	87.7	87.7
	No	60	12.1	12.3	100.0
	Total	488	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.8		
Total		497	100.0		

B3c. Heard of specific goals: Reinforce grant-in-aid philosophy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	205	41.2	41.9	41.9
	No	284	57.1	58.1	100.0
	Total	489	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.6		
Total		497	100.0		

B3d. Heard of specific goals: Accommodate PIs need for flexibility

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	374	75.3	76.3	76.3
	No	116	23.3	23.7	100.0
	Total	490	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.4		
Total		497	100.0		

B4a. Achieved specific goals: Reduce administrative burden for peer reviewers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	67	13.5	14.0	14.0
	To some extent	222	44.7	46.4	60.5
	To a large extent	189	38.0	39.5	100.0
	Total	478	96.2	100.0	
Missing	DK	12	2.4		
	System	7	1.4		
	Total	19	3.8		
Total		497	100.0		

B4b. Achieved specific goals: Focus efforts of peer reviewers on scientific content of the grant application

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	50	10.1	10.4	10.4
	To some extent	200	40.2	41.5	51.9
	To a large extent	232	46.7	48.1	100.0
	Total	482	97.0	100.0	
Missing	DK	7	1.4		
	System	8	1.6		
	Total	15	3.0		
Total		497	100.0		

B4c. Achieved specific goals: Reinforce grant-in-aid philosophy

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	94	18.9	25.1	25.1
	To some extent	149	30.0	39.7	64.8
	To a large extent	132	26.6	35.2	100.0
	Total	375	75.5	100.0	
Missing	DK	115	23.1		
	System	7	1.4		
	Total	122	24.5		
Total		497	100.0		

B4d. Achieved specific goals: Accommodate PIs need for flexibility

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	46	9.3	10.0	10.0
	To some extent	169	34.0	36.6	46.5
	To a large extent	247	49.7	53.5	100.0
	Total	462	93.0	100.0	
Missing	DK	25	5.0		
	System	10	2.0		
	Total	35	7.0		
Total		497	100.0		

B5. Do you think there are other reasons for the implementation of the modular grant application process?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	120	24.1	26.7	26.7
	No	330	66.4	73.3	100.0
	Total	450	90.5	100.0	
Missing	System	47	9.5		
Total		497	100.0		

B6. Have you ever received information on the review of modular grant applications?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	424	85.3	86.9	86.9
	No	64	12.9	13.1	100.0
	Total	488	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.8		
Total		497	100.0		

B7. How satisfied were you with the information you received about the review of modular grant applications?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Satisfied	95	19.1	22.7	22.7
	Satisfied	249	50.1	59.6	82.3
	Neither	66	13.3	15.8	98.1
	Dissatisfied	6	1.2	1.4	99.5
	Very Dissatisfied	2	.4	.5	100.0
	Total	418	84.1	100.0	
Missing	System	79	15.9		
Total		497	100.0		

B7 Collapsed - Satisfaction with information on reviewing modular grants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Satisfied	344	69.2	82.3	82.3
	Neutral	66	13.3	15.8	98.1
	Dissatisfied	8	1.6	1.9	100.0
	Total	418	84.1	100.0	
Missing	System	79	15.9		
Total		497	100.0		

C1. Experience with modular grants: Impeded ability to learn about how much different elements of a research project cost

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	58	11.7	12.1	12.1
	Agree	168	33.8	35.0	47.1
	Neither	68	13.7	14.2	61.3
	Disagree	127	25.6	26.5	87.7
	Strongly Disagree	59	11.9	12.3	100.0
	Total	480	96.6	100.0	
Missing	DK	3	.6		
	System	14	2.8		
	Total	17	3.4		
Total		497	100.0		

C1 Collapsed - Impeded ability to learn about how much a research project costs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	226	45.5	47.1	47.1
	Neutral	68	13.7	14.2	61.3
	Disagree	186	37.4	38.8	100.0
	Total	480	96.6	100.0	
Missing	System	17	3.4		
Total		497	100.0		

C2. Experience with modular grants: Lack of detailed budget helps focus on scientific content of the applications

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	72	14.5	15.0	15.0
	Agree	193	38.8	40.3	55.3
	Neither	93	18.7	19.4	74.7
	Disagree	90	18.1	18.8	93.5
	Strongly Disagree	31	6.2	6.5	100.0
	Total	479	96.4	100.0	
Missing	DK	4	.8		
	System	14	2.8		
	Total	18	3.6		
Total		497	100.0		

C2 Collapsed - Lack of detailed budget helps focus on scientific content

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	265	53.3	55.3	55.3
	Neutral	93	18.7	19.4	74.7
	Disagree	121	24.3	25.3	100.0
	Total	479	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	18	3.6		
Total		497	100.0		

C3. Experience with modular grants: Negatively affected working relationship between me and the SRA of my study section

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	3	.6	.6	.6
	Agree	6	1.2	1.3	1.9
	Neither	53	10.7	11.2	13.1
	Disagree	147	29.6	31.1	44.2
	Strongly Disagree	264	53.1	55.8	100.0
	Total	473	95.2	100.0	
Missing	DK	10	2.0		
	System	14	2.8		
	Total	24	4.8		
Total		497	100.0		

C3 Collapsed - Negatively affected working relationship between me and the SRA of my study section

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	9	1.8	1.9	1.9
	Neutral	53	10.7	11.2	13.1
	Disagree	411	82.7	86.9	100.0
	Total	473	95.2	100.0	
Missing	System	24	4.8		
Total		497	100.0		

C4. Experience with modular grants: Discussions about budget in study section are much more limited

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	102	20.5	21.7	21.7
	Agree	230	46.3	48.8	70.5
	Neither	65	13.1	13.8	84.3
	Disagree	56	11.3	11.9	96.2
	Strongly Disagree	18	3.6	3.8	100.0
	Total	471	94.8	100.0	
Missing	DK	12	2.4		
	System	14	2.8		
	Total	26	5.2		
Total		497	100.0		

C4 Collapsed - Discussions about budget in study section are much more limited

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	332	66.8	70.5	70.5
	Neutral	65	13.1	13.8	84.3
	Disagree	74	14.9	15.7	100.0
	Total	471	94.8	100.0	
Missing	System	26	5.2		
Total		497	100.0		

C5. Experience with modular grants: Can assess scientific merit of application without detailed budget

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	164	33.0	34.1	34.1
	Agree	253	50.9	52.6	86.7
	Neither	18	3.6	3.7	90.4
	Disagree	35	7.0	7.3	97.7
	Strongly Disagree	11	2.2	2.3	100.0
	Total	481	96.8	100.0	
Missing	DK	1	.2		
	System	15	3.0		
	Total	16	3.2		
Total		497	100.0		

C5 Collapsed - Can assess scientific merit without detailed budget

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	417	83.9	86.7	86.7
	Neutral	18	3.6	3.7	90.4
	Disagree	46	9.3	9.6	100.0
	Total	481	96.8	100.0	
Missing	System	16	3.2		
Total		497	100.0		

C6. Experience with modular grants: Can assess scientific merit of application without Other Support pages

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	82	16.5	17.0	17.0
	Agree	217	43.7	45.0	62.0
	Neither	48	9.7	10.0	72.0
	Disagree	105	21.1	21.8	93.8
	Strongly Disagree	30	6.0	6.2	100.0
	Total	482	97.0	100.0	
Missing	DK	1	.2		
	System	14	2.8		
	Total	15	3.0		
Total		497	100.0		

C6 Collapsed - Can assess scientific merit without Other Support pages

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	299	60.2	62.0	62.0
	Neutral	48	9.7	10.0	72.0
	Disagree	135	27.2	28.0	100.0
	Total	482	97.0	100.0	
Missing	System	15	3.0		
Total		497	100.0		

C7. Experience with modular grants: IRB/IACUC approvals are not necessary for me to make good assessment of scientific content

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	181	36.4	38.4	38.4
	Agree	218	43.9	46.3	84.7
	Neither	30	6.0	6.4	91.1
	Disagree	31	6.2	6.6	97.7
	Strongly Disagree	11	2.2	2.3	100.0
	Total	471	94.8	100.0	
Missing	DK	11	2.2		
	System	15	3.0		
	Total	26	5.2		
Total		497	100.0		

C7 Collapsed - IRB/IACUC approvals are not necessary for a good assessment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	399	80.3	84.7	84.7
	Neutral	30	6.0	6.4	91.1
	Disagree	42	8.5	8.9	100.0
	Total	471	94.8	100.0	
Missing	System	26	5.2		
Total		497	100.0		

C8. Experience with modular grants: I am not comfortable recommending budget cuts without being able to view a detailed budget

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	61	12.3	12.7	12.7
	Agree	139	28.0	28.8	41.5
	Neither	52	10.5	10.8	52.3
	Disagree	166	33.4	34.4	86.7
	Strongly Disagree	64	12.9	13.3	100.0
	Total	482	97.0	100.0	
Missing	DK	1	.2		
	System	14	2.8		
	Total	15	3.0		
Total		497	100.0		

Peer Reviewers

C8 Collapsed - Uncomfortable recommending budget cuts without a detailed budget

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	200	40.2	41.5	41.5
	Neutral	52	10.5	10.8	52.3
	Disagree	230	46.3	47.7	100.0
	Total	482	97.0	100.0	
Missing	System	15	3.0		
Total		497	100.0		

C9. Changes in study section meetings

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increased significantly	10	2.0	2.2	2.2
	Increased slightly	14	2.8	3.1	5.4
	Remained the same	272	54.7	61.1	66.5
	Decreased slightly	133	26.8	29.9	96.4
	Decreased significantly	16	3.2	3.6	100.0
	Total	445	89.5	100.0	
Missing	System	52	10.5		
Total		497	100.0		

C9 Collapsed - Changes in study section meetings

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increased	24	4.8	5.4	5.4
	Remained the same	272	54.7	61.1	66.5
	Decreased	149	30.0	33.5	100.0
	Total	445	89.5	100.0	
Missing	System	52	10.5		
Total		497	100.0		

C10. Changes in responsibilities as a peer reviewer

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increased significantly	4	.8	.8	.8
	Increased slightly	15	3.0	3.1	4.0
	Remained the same	283	56.9	59.2	63.2
	Decreased slightly	168	33.8	35.1	98.3
	Decreased significantly	8	1.6	1.7	100.0
	Total	478	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	19	3.8		
Total		497	100.0		

C10 Collapsed - Changes in responsibilities as a peer reviewer

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increased	19	3.8	4.0	4.0
	Remained the same	283	56.9	59.2	63.2
	Decreased	176	35.4	36.8	100.0
	Total	478	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	19	3.8		
Total		497	100.0		

C11. Time to review a modular grant application compared to a nonmodular grant application

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Much more time	1	.2	.2	.2
	Somewhat more time	8	1.6	1.7	1.9
	About the same	293	59.0	60.8	62.7
	Somewhat less time	174	35.0	36.1	98.8
	Much less time	6	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	482	97.0	100.0	
Missing	System	15	3.0		
Total		497	100.0		

C11 Collapsed - Time to review a modular grant application compared to a nonmodular grant application

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	More time	9	1.8	1.9	1.9
	About the same	293	59.0	60.8	62.7
	Less time	180	36.2	37.3	100.0
	Total	482	97.0	100.0	
Missing	System	15	3.0		
Total		497	100.0		

C12a. Study section meeting time devoted to discussing proposed budget before modular grants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	7	1.4	1.6	1.6
	2	41	8.2	9.6	11.2
	3	38	7.6	8.9	20.1
	4	22	4.4	5.1	25.2
	5	138	27.8	32.2	57.5
	6	9	1.8	2.1	59.6
	7	7	1.4	1.6	61.2
	8	15	3.0	3.5	64.7
	10	81	16.3	18.9	83.6
	15	27	5.4	6.3	90.0
	17	2	.4	.5	90.4
	18	1	.2	.2	90.7
	20	20	4.0	4.7	95.3
	22	1	.2	.2	95.6
	25	4	.8	.9	96.5
	30	5	1.0	1.2	97.7
	35	2	.4	.5	98.1
	40	2	.4	.5	98.6
	45	1	.2	.2	98.8
	60	5	1.0	1.2	100.0
	Total	428	86.1	100.0	
Missing	System	69	13.9		
Total		497	100.0		

Statistics

C12a. Study section meeting time devoted to discussing proposed budget before modular grants

N	Valid	428
	Missing	69
Median		5.00

C12b. Study section meeting time devoted to discussing proposed budget after modular grants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	4	.8	.9	.9
	1	74	14.9	16.8	17.7
	2	108	21.7	24.5	42.3
	3	68	13.7	15.5	57.7
	4	9	1.8	2.0	59.8
	5	100	20.1	22.7	82.5
	6	5	1.0	1.1	83.6
	7	3	.6	.7	84.3
	8	5	1.0	1.1	85.5
	9	1	.2	.2	85.7
	10	16	3.2	3.6	89.3
	12	2	.4	.5	89.8
	13	2	.4	.5	90.2
	14	2	.4	.5	90.7
	15	13	2.6	3.0	93.6
	17	1	.2	.2	93.9
	18	3	.6	.7	94.5
	20	13	2.6	3.0	97.5
	21	1	.2	.2	97.7
	25	2	.4	.5	98.2
	27	1	.2	.2	98.4
	30	3	.6	.7	99.1
	40	1	.2	.2	99.3
	45	1	.2	.2	99.5
	60	2	.4	.5	100.0
	Total	440	88.5	100.0	
Missing	System	57	11.5		
Total		497	100.0		

Statistics

C12b. Study section meeting time devoted to discussing proposed budget after modular grants

N	Valid	440
	Missing	57
Median		3.00

C12A - C12B: Difference in Study Section Meeting Time After Modular Grants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	-3.00	2	.4	.5	.5
	-2.00	1	.2	.2	.7
	.00	108	21.7	25.2	25.9
	1.00	43	8.7	10.0	36.0
	2.00	61	12.3	14.3	50.2
	3.00	58	11.7	13.6	63.8
	4.00	34	6.8	7.9	71.7
	5.00	53	10.7	12.4	84.1
	6.00	5	1.0	1.2	85.3
	7.00	14	2.8	3.3	88.6
	8.00	16	3.2	3.7	92.3
	9.00	2	.4	.5	92.8
	10.00	16	3.2	3.7	96.5
	12.00	3	.6	.7	97.2
	13.00	3	.6	.7	97.9
	15.00	5	1.0	1.2	99.1
	20.00	1	.2	.2	99.3
	35.00	1	.2	.2	99.5
	40.00	1	.2	.2	99.8
	50.00	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	428	86.1	100.0	
Missing	System	69	13.9		
Total		497	100.0		

Statistics

C12A - C12B: Difference in Study Section Meeting Time After Modular Grants

N	Valid	428
	Missing	69
Median		2.0000

D1. Opinion of modular grants: Reviewers generally know how much proposed research project should cost

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	64	12.9	13.3	13.3
	Agree	311	62.6	64.8	78.1
	Neither	48	9.7	10.0	88.1
	Disagree	52	10.5	10.8	99.0
	Strongly Disagree	5	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	480	96.6	100.0	
Missing	DK	1	.2		
	System	16	3.2		
	Total	17	3.4		
Total		497	100.0		

D1 Collapsed - Reviewers generally costs of proposed research projects

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	375	75.5	78.1	78.1
	Neutral	48	9.7	10.0	88.1
	Disagree	57	11.5	11.9	100.0
	Total	480	96.6	100.0	
Missing	System	17	3.4		
Total		497	100.0		

D2. Opinion of modular grants: New reviewers should receive training on how to determine reasonable proposed costs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	49	9.9	10.3	10.3
	Agree	214	43.1	44.9	55.1
	Neither	118	23.7	24.7	79.9
	Disagree	87	17.5	18.2	98.1
	Strongly Disagree	9	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	477	96.0	100.0	
Missing	DK	2	.4		
	System	18	3.6		
	Total	20	4.0		
Total		497	100.0		

D2 Collapsed - New reviewers should receive training on determining reasonable costs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	263	52.9	55.1	55.1
	Neutral	118	23.7	24.7	79.9
	Disagree	96	19.3	20.1	100.0
	Total	477	96.0	100.0	
Missing	System	20	4.0		
Total		497	100.0		

D3. Opinion of modular grants: In many applications, overall costs appear to be inflated

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	76	15.3	15.9	15.9
	Agree	117	23.5	24.5	40.4
	Neither	146	29.4	30.5	70.9
	Disagree	122	24.5	25.5	96.4
	Strongly Disagree	17	3.4	3.6	100.0
	Total	478	96.2	100.0	
Missing	DK	2	.4		
	System	17	3.4		
	Total	19	3.8		
Total		497	100.0		

D3 Collapsed - In many applications, overall costs appear to be inflated

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	193	38.8	40.4	40.4
	Neutral	146	29.4	30.5	70.9
	Disagree	139	28.0	29.1	100.0
	Total	478	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	19	3.8		
Total		497	100.0		

D4. Opinion of modular grants: The more budget justification PIs provide, the more reviewers understand their proposal, and the higher the score they receive

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	18	3.6	3.8	3.8
	Agree	66	13.3	13.8	17.5
	Neither	106	21.3	22.1	39.6
	Disagree	211	42.5	44.0	83.5
	Strongly Disagree	79	15.9	16.5	100.0
	Total	480	96.6	100.0	
Missing	DK	1	.2		
	System	16	3.2		
	Total	17	3.4		
Total		497	100.0		

D4 Collapsed - The more budget justification PIs provide, the higher the score they receive

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	84	16.9	17.5	17.5
	Neutral	106	21.3	22.1	39.6
	Disagree	290	58.4	60.4	100.0
	Total	480	96.6	100.0	
Missing	System	17	3.4		
Total		497	100.0		

D5. Opinion of modular grants: Making recommendations to cut a module is a waste a time as ultimately the PI will be awarded the amount requested

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	7	1.4	1.6	1.6
	Agree	18	3.6	4.0	5.6
	Neither	49	9.9	11.0	16.6
	Disagree	222	44.7	49.9	66.5
	Strongly Disagree	149	30.0	33.5	100.0
	Total	445	89.5	100.0	
Missing	DK	36	7.2		
	System	16	3.2		
	Total	52	10.5		
Total		497	100.0		

D5 Collapsed - Making recommendations to cut a module is a waste a time

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	25	5.0	5.6	5.6
	Neutral	49	9.9	11.0	16.6
	Disagree	371	74.6	83.4	100.0
	Total	445	89.5	100.0	
Missing	System	52	10.5		
Total		497	100.0		

D6. Opinion of modular grants: Peer reviewers do not need detailed budget to understand the proposed research project

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	100	20.1	21.0	21.0
	Agree	282	56.7	59.2	80.3
	Neither	27	5.4	5.7	85.9
	Disagree	53	10.7	11.1	97.1
	Strongly Disagree	14	2.8	2.9	100.0
	Total	476	95.8	100.0	
Missing	DK	2	.4		
	System	19	3.8		
	Total	21	4.2		
Total		497	100.0		

D6 Collapsed - Peer reviewers do not need detailed budget to understand the proposed research project

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	382	76.9	80.3	80.3
	Neutral	27	5.4	5.7	85.9
	Disagree	67	13.5	14.1	100.0
	Total	476	95.8	100.0	
Missing	System	21	4.2		
Total		497	100.0		

D7. Opinion of modular grants: Listing dollar value totals for major categories would be a good compromise

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	52	10.5	10.9	10.9
	Agree	186	37.4	38.9	49.8
	Neither	93	18.7	19.5	69.2
	Disagree	112	22.5	23.4	92.7
	Strongly Disagree	35	7.0	7.3	100.0
	Total	478	96.2	100.0	
Missing	DK	3	.6		
	System	16	3.2		
	Total	19	3.8		
Total		497	100.0		

D7 Collapsed - Listing dollar value totals for major categories would be a good compromise

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	238	47.9	49.8	49.8
	Neutral	93	18.7	19.5	69.2
	Disagree	147	29.6	30.8	100.0
	Total	478	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	19	3.8		
Total		497	100.0		

D8a. Changes in the average amount of requested funding

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increased	231	46.5	48.6	48.6
	Stayed the same	213	42.9	44.8	93.5
	Decreased	31	6.2	6.5	100.0
	Total	475	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	22	4.4		
Total		497	100.0		

D8b. Changes in the average size of awards

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increased	199	40.0	42.2	42.2
	Stayed the same	231	46.5	48.9	91.1
	Decreased	42	8.5	8.9	100.0
	Total	472	95.0	100.0	
Missing	System	25	5.0		
Total		497	100.0		

E1. Overall satisfaction with the modular grant application process

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Satisfied	117	23.5	24.6	24.6
	Satisfied	230	46.3	48.4	73.1
	Neither	59	11.9	12.4	85.5
	Dissatisfied	59	11.9	12.4	97.9
	Very Dissatisfied	10	2.0	2.1	100.0
	Total	475	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	22	4.4		
Total		497	100.0		

E1 Collapsed - Overall satisfaction with the modular grant application process

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Satisfied	347	69.8	73.1	73.1
	Neutral	59	11.9	12.4	85.5
	Dissatisfied	69	13.9	14.5	100.0
	Total	475	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	22	4.4		
Total		497	100.0		

E2. Would you prefer the modular grant limit be higher than $250,000?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	185	37.2	45.8	45.8
	No	219	44.1	54.2	100.0
	Total	404	81.3	100.0	
Missing	DK	68	13.7		
	System	25	5.0		
	Total	93	18.7		
Total		497	100.0		