

## DFCM INVESTIGATOR AWARDS

### ANNUAL REVIEW CRITERIA

Approved May 16, 2019

#### 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 Non-Clinician Research Scientist Award** (non-clinician PhD researcher with  $\geq 80\%$  protected time for research)
- **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** (maximum of 2 years when completing a Master's 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 from the DFCM
- Availability of enhanced matched salary support from your clinical site (or other approved source) for the next annual term
- Continued endorsement by your site Chief (or the Director/Chair of the organization responsible for guaranteeing the enhanced matched funding for the DFCM Investigator Award)
- Successful annual internal reviews by the Vice-Chair and/or Associate Director, Research and Advocacy Program that includes meeting expectations related to research productivity and contributions to the DFCM (detailed annual review criteria are available for each type of DFCM Investigator Award)
- Holding an academic appointment (or equivalent) in the DFCM
- Successful formal external reviews every five years (for Clinician Scientists/Clinician Investigators/Non-Clinician Research Scientist)

To succeed in annual reviews, award recipients must show that they meet the criteria, which include: that their research aligns with the University of Toronto Practice-Based Research Network (UTOPIAN); they have maintained research productivity to levels of expectation in accordance with the award category; and they have made contributions to research at the DFCM. Award recipients are required to submit, in advance, a completed Annual Review Form to be assessed during annual review meetings with the DFCM Vice-Chair and/or the Associate Director of the Research and Advocacy Program.

The annual review criteria outlined below were revised in 2019 and approved by the Research Executive Committee (REC) on [May 16, 2019] and, subject to ratification by the DFCM Chair, will be the basis of annual reviews as from the next five-year reviews scheduled for early 2020.

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

The Vice-Chair, Research and Advocacy will send each of the DFCM Investigator Award recipients (copied to their respective site Chief or the Director/Chair of the organization responsible for guaranteeing the enhanced matched funding for the DFCM Investigator Award) the revised criteria once approved by the DFCM Chair. Award recipients will be asked to return within 30 days a signed copy of the revised Annual Review Criteria. These criteria will then be used for subsequent annual reviews and five-year review. 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, a completed Annual Review Form to be assessed during annual review meetings with the DFCM Vice-Chair and/or the Associate Director of the Research and Advocacy Program. Concerns identified during these annual review meetings will be taken to the DFCM REC for 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. If it's the REC's recommendation to terminate funding, this will be communicated to the DFCM Chair, through the Vice-Chair, Research and Advocacy. There is no appeal following the decision by the DFCM Chair. If the decision is to terminate funding, funds will be terminated three months after the decision date.

### **1.3 Five-Year Review Process**

The next five-year reviews will be scheduled for early 2020 and will cover the period January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2019. Award recipients will submit, in advance, a completed Five-Year Review Form to be assessed during the five-year review meeting with the DFCM Vice-Chair and the Associate Director of the Research and Advocacy 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 REC for 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. If it's the REC's recommendation to terminate funding, this will be communicated to the DFCM Chair, through the Vice-Chair, Research and Advocacy. There is no appeal following the decision by the DFCM Chair. If the decision is to terminate funding, funds will be terminated three months after the decision date.

## 2.0 ANNUAL REVIEW CRITERIA FOR NON-CLINICIAN RESEARCH SCIENTIST

- There is only one possible position available for a Non-Clinician Research Scientist. A Non-Clinician Research Scientist is a DFCM faculty member who is an established primary care researcher with a PhD or equivalent who typically is a principal investigator on research grants and first author or senior author on peer-reviewed publications.
- The criteria listed below for evaluating a Non-Clinician Research Scientist (those with  $\geq 80\%$  protected research time) will take into account both their stage of career (early, mid, senior) and percentage of protected time for research. These criteria are consistent with the requirements for academic promotion.
- A Non-Clinician Research Scientist must 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.

## 2.1 Required Academic Contributions

- **Evidence of Research Mentorship and Graduate Student Supervisory Roles:**
  - Must have a formal mentorship role in support of one or more DFCM faculty members.
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist must apply for a SGS appointment if they do not already have one and then must be looking to be on one or more graduate thesis committees.
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist who holds a SGS appointment must have a supervisory role (thesis supervisor or thesis committee member) for one or more graduate students enrolled in Master's or PhD programs.
  - Must provide evidence of research productivity (i.e., grants, publications, presentations) of all supervised graduate students and DFCM faculty, residents, colleagues and others who were mentored for the calendar year under review.
- **Participation in DFCM Activities:**
  - Must attend more than 50% of DFCM City Wide Research Rounds, attend the DFCM Conference each year, and present at one of these activities at least once in a three-year period and participate in other DFCM activities (e.g., be a judge for the DFCM Resident Academic Project Day).
- **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. This collaboration should be in keeping with the goals and objectives of the DFCM Investigator Award.
    - *Note: Although the intent of this requirement is to collaborate with other DFCM faculty, it is recognized that some collaborative research relationships can take place with non DFCM faculty.*
- **Evidence of Research Collaboration with UTOPIAN**
  - Must show evidence of a meaningful research collaboration with UTOPIAN for those whose awards were granted after [January 2017]. All others must show evidence that their current and future research plans include collaboration with UTOPIAN or justify why this is not possible.
- **Evidence of Research Leadership/Administrative Activities**
  - Must show evidence of one or more research leadership/administrative roles. For an early career Non-Clinician Research Scientist, this would normally be at the Site/Local or Provincial levels. For a mid or senior career Non-Clinician Research Scientist, this would be at the University, National or International levels. Other examples include membership on graduate studies admissions committees, peer-review committees such as for FMF submissions, Janus grants or CIHR grants.

- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Family Medicine Teaching Units/Divisions:**
  - Must be associated with one of the DFCM’s family medicine teaching units or similar DFCM-related research groups (e.g., SREMI, UTOPIAN) and show evidence of participation in their committee meetings, discussion groups and rounds.
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Research and Advocacy Program:**
  - Must take part in the internal grant application review process, when requested, to review 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 increased the research capacity of the DFCM and made an impact on clinical practice, policy, teaching, research etc., at the Local, Provincial, National and/or International levels.

## 2.2 Required Research Productivity

- **Grants and Contracts:**
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist is expected to hold at least one active grant or contract as PI or Co-PI (preferably peer-reviewed grants) 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 one peer-reviewed grant or contract as PI or Co-PI over the three-year period from January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018. The next three-year period will begin January 1, 2019 (or for new award recipients, the year in which they first received the award).
    - *Note: On team grants, individual project PIs (with dedicated budgets) are considered PIs.*
  - In addition to holding at least one active grant or contract as PI or Co-PI, a Non-Clinician Research Scientist must hold at least one other grant or contract (preferably peer-reviewed grants) as either PI, Co-PI or Co-I *at all times* or have at least one grant or contract application under review in each calendar year as either PI, Co-PI, or Co-I.
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist must address the relevance to family medicine/primary care of each of their research grants, contracts and their programs of research in the Annual Review Form.
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist must clearly indicate in their CV and Annual Review Form their roles on all grants and contracts.
- **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 of value and should be reported but are not considered original research for the purpose of this research productivity review.
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist should be aiming for the “best” journals in their respective field(s).
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist must address the relevance to family medicine/primary care of each of their research publications in the Annual Review Form.
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist with  $\geq 80\%$  protected research time is expected to have at least four peer-reviewed publications in most calendar years (an average of at least 12 peer-reviewed publications over the 3-year period from January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018). The next 3-year period will begin January 1, 2019 (or for new award recipients, the year in which they first received the award). Of the above 12 peer-reviewed publications, at least four are expected to be either as first author or senior

responsible author. An early career Non-Clinician Research Scientist should be focusing on first author publications whereas a senior Non-Clinician Research Scientist is more likely to be a senior responsible author.

- A Non-Clinician Research Scientist must also clearly indicate in their CV and Annual Review Form their roles on all publications.
- **Peer-Reviewed Presentations:**
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist 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 on average at least once per year). The presentation may take the form of an oral presentation, poster presentation or workshop.
  - Depending on stage of career, a Non-Clinician Research Scientist is also expected to have invited research presentations/keynote presentations. For an early career Non-Clinician Research Scientist this would normally be at the Local or Provincial levels with a mid and senior career Non-Clinician Research Scientist at the National or International levels. The expectation is for at least one National or International invited/keynote presentation in a three-year period.
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist must also clearly indicate in their CV and Annual Review Forms their roles on all peer-reviewed presentations and specify the type (oral presentation, poster presentation, workshop, invited/keynote presentation) and audience (Local, Provincial, National, International).
- **Other Knowledge Translation/Dissemination Activities:**
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist should make an effort to engage in knowledge translation/dissemination activities, in addition to the traditional peer review mechanism, to reach a wider audience for whom the research is relevant.
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist must address the following question in the Annual Review Form:
    - What activities did you engage in to disseminate your research to relevant audiences beyond the traditional peer review mechanisms?
- **Career Awards:**
  - A Non-Clinician Research Scientist 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.
  - Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award in 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 SCIENTISTS

- Clinician Scientists are DFCM faculty members who are both active clinicians and primary care researchers who typically are principal investigators on research grants and first author or senior authors on peer-reviewed publications.
- The criteria listed below for evaluating Clinician Scientists (those with  $\geq 50\%$  protected research time) will take into account both their stage of career (early, mid, senior) and percentage of protected time for research. These criteria are consistent with the requirements for academic promotion.
- All Clinician Scientists must 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.

### 3.1 Required Academic Contributions

- **Evidence of Research Mentorship and Graduate Student Supervisory Roles:**
  - Must have a formal mentorship role in support of one or more DFCM faculty members.
  - All Clinician Scientists must apply for a SGS appointment if they do not already have one and then must be looking to be on one or more graduate thesis committees.
  - All Clinician Scientists who hold SGS appointments must have a supervisory role (thesis supervisor or thesis committee member) for one or more graduate students enrolled in Master's or PhD programs.
  - Must provide evidence of research productivity (i.e., grants, publications, presentations) of all supervised graduate students and DFCM faculty, residents, colleagues and others who were mentored for the calendar year under review.
- **Participation in DFCM Activities:**
  - Must attend more than 50% of DFCM City Wide Research Rounds, attend the DFCM Conference each year, and present at one of these activities at least once in a three-year period and participate in other DFCM activities (e.g., be a judge for the DFCM Resident Academic Project Day).
- **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. This collaboration should be in keeping with the goals and objectives of the DFCM Investigator Award.
    - *Note: Although the intent of this requirement is to collaborate with other DFCM faculty, it is recognized that some collaborative research relationships can take place with non DFCM faculty.*
- **Evidence of Research Collaboration with UTOPIAN**
  - Must show evidence of a meaningful research collaboration with UTOPIAN for those whose awards were granted after [January 2017]. All others must show evidence that their current and future research plans include collaboration with UTOPIAN or justify why this is not possible.
- **Evidence of Research Leadership/Administrative Activities**
  - Must show evidence of one or more research leadership/administrative roles. For early career Clinician Scientists, this would normally be at the Site/Local or Provincial levels. For mid and senior career Clinician Scientists, this would be at the University, National or International levels. Other examples include membership on graduate studies admissions committees, peer-review committees such as for FMF submissions, Janus grants or CIHR grants.

- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Family Medicine Teaching Units/Divisions:**
  - Must be associated with one of the DFCM’s family medicine teaching units or similar DFCM-related research groups (e.g., SREMI, UTOPIAN) and show evidence of participation in their committee meetings, discussion groups and rounds.
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Research and Advocacy Program:**
  - Must take part in the internal grant application review process, when requested, to review 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 increased the research capacity of the DFCM and made an impact on clinical practice, policy, teaching, research etc., at the Local, Provincial, National and/or International levels.

### 3.2 Required Research Productivity

- **Grants and Contracts:**
  - Clinician Scientists are expected to hold at least one active grant or contract as PI or Co-PI (preferably peer-reviewed grants) 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 one peer-reviewed grant or contract as PI or Co-PI over the three-year period from January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018. The next three-year period will begin January 1, 2019 (or for new award recipients, the year in which they first received the award).
    - *Note: On team grants, individual project PIs (with dedicated budgets) are considered PIs.*
  - In addition to holding at least one active grant or contract as PI or Co-PI, a Clinician Scientist must hold at least one other grant or contract (preferably peer-reviewed grants) as either PI, Co-PI or Co-I *at all times* or have at least one grant or contract application under review in each calendar year as either PI, Co-PI, or Co-I.
  - Clinician Scientists must address the relevance to family medicine/primary care of each of their research grants, contracts and their programs of research in the Annual Review Form.
  - Clinician Scientists must clearly indicate in their CVs and Annual Review Forms their roles on all grants and contracts.
- **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 of value and should be reported but are not considered original research for the purpose of this research productivity review.
  - Clinician Scientists should be aiming for the “best” journals in their respective fields.
  - Clinician Scientists must address the relevance to family medicine/primary care of each of their research publications in the Annual Review Form.
  - Clinician Scientists with 50 to 60% protected research time are expected to have at least three peer-reviewed publications in most calendar years (an average of at least nine peer-reviewed publications over the 3-year period from January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018. The next 3-year period will begin January 1, 2019 (or for new award recipients, the year in which they first received the award). Of the above nine peer-reviewed publications, at least three are expected to be either as first author or senior responsible author. Early career Clinician Scientists should be focusing on first author publications whereas senior

- Clinician Scientists are more likely to be senior responsible authors.
- Clinician Scientists with >60% protected research time are expected to have at least four peer-reviewed publications in most calendar years (an average of at least 12 peer-reviewed publications over the three calendar years, of which at least four are expected to be either as first author or senior author).
  - Clinician Scientists must also clearly indicate in their CVs and Annual Review Forms their roles on all publications.
  - **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 on average at least once per year). The presentation may take the form of an oral presentation, poster presentation or workshop.
    - Depending on stage of career, Clinician Scientists are also expected to have invited research presentations/keynote presentations. For early career Clinician Scientists this would normally be at the Local or Provincial levels with mid and senior career Clinician Scientists at the National or International levels. The expectation is for at least one National or International invited/keynote presentation in a three-year period.
    - Clinician Scientists must also clearly indicate in their CVs and Annual Review Forms their roles on all peer-reviewed presentations and specify the type (oral presentation, poster presentation, workshop, invited/keynote presentation) and audience (Local, Provincial, National, International).
  - **Other Knowledge Translation/Dissemination Activities:**
    - Clinician Scientists should make an effort to engage in knowledge translation/dissemination activities, in addition to the traditional peer review mechanism, to reach a wider audience for whom the research is relevant.
    - The Clinician Scientist must address the following question in the Annual Review Form:
      - What activities did you engage in to disseminate your research to relevant audiences beyond the traditional peer review mechanisms?
  - **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.
    - Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award in 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 CLINICIAN INVESTIGATORS

- Clinician Investigators are DFCM faculty members who are both active clinicians and primary care researchers who typically (especially early in their careers) are co-investigators on research grants and co-authors on peer-reviewed publications.
- The criteria listed below for evaluating Clinician Investigators (those with <50% protected research time) will take into account both their stage of career (early, mid, senior) and percentage of protected time for research. These criteria are consistent with the requirements for academic promotion.
- All Clinician Investigators must 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.

#### 4.1 Required Academic Contributions

- **Evidence of Research Mentorship and Graduate Student Supervisory Roles:**
  - Must have a formal mentorship role in support of one or more DFCM faculty members.
  - Mid and senior career Clinician Investigators with  $\geq 40\%$  protected time for research are expected to have a supervisory role (thesis supervisor or thesis committee member) for one or more graduate students enrolled in Master's or PhD programs. Early career Clinician Investigators with  $\geq 40\%$  protected time for research must apply for a SGS appointment if they do not already have one and then must be looking to be on one or more graduate thesis committees.
  - Must provide evidence of research productivity (i.e., grants, publications, presentations) of all supervised graduate students and DFCM faculty, residents, colleagues and others who were mentored for the calendar year under review.
- **Participation in DFCM Activities:**
  - Must attend more than 50% of DFCM City Wide Research Rounds, attend the DFCM Conference each year, and present at one of these activities at least once in a three-year period and participate in other DFCM activities (e.g., be a judge for the DFCM Resident Academic Project Day).
- **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. This collaboration should be in keeping with the goals and objectives of the DFCM Investigator Award.
    - *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 Research Collaboration with UTOPIAN**
  - Must show evidence of a meaningful research collaboration with UTOPIAN for those whose awards were granted after [January 2017]. All others must show evidence that their current and future research plans include collaboration with UTOPIAN or justify why this is not possible.
- **Evidence of Research Leadership/Administrative Activities**
  - Clinician Investigators with  $\geq 40\%$  protected time for research must show evidence of one or more research leadership/administrative roles. For early career Clinician Investigators, this would normally be at the Site/Local or Provincial levels. For mid and senior career Clinician Investigators, this would be at the University, National or International levels. Other examples include membership on graduate studies admissions committees, peer-review committees such as for FMF submissions, Janus grants or CIHR grants.

- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Family Medicine Teaching Units/Divisions:**
  - Must be associated with one of the DFCM’s family medicine teaching units or similar DFCM-related research groups (e.g., SREMI, UTOPIAN) and show evidence of participation in their committee meetings, discussion groups and rounds.
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Research and Advocacy 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 increased the research capacity of the DFCM and made an impact on clinical practice, policy, teaching, research etc., at the Local, Provincial, National and/or International levels.

#### 4.2 Required Research Productivity

- **Grants and Contracts:**
  - Clinician Investigators must hold at least one active grant or contract as a PI, Co-PI or Co-Investigator (preferably peer-reviewed grants) in each calendar year and submit applications for grants or contracts (preferably peer-reviewed grants) as needed to ensure that at least one grant or contract is held at all times as PI, Co-PI or Co-Investigator.
  - Clinician Investigators must address the relevance to family medicine/primary care of each of their research grants and contracts and their programs of research in the Annual Review Form.
  - Clinician Investigators must also clearly indicate in their CVs and Annual Review Forms their roles on all grants and contracts.
- **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 of value and should be reported but are not considered original research for the purpose of this research productivity review.
  - Clinician Investigators should be aiming for the “best” journals in their respective fields.
  - Clinician Investigators must address the relevance to family medicine/primary care of each of their research publications in the Annual Review Form.
  - Clinician Investigators with  $\geq 40\%$  protected research time are expected to have at least two peer-reviewed publications in most calendar years (an average of at least six peer-reviewed publications over the three-year period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018). The next three-year period will begin January 1, 2019 (or for new award recipients, the year in which they first received the award).
  - Of the above six peer-reviewed publications, for mid and senior career Clinician Investigators, at least two are expected to be either as first author or senior responsible author.
  - Clinician Investigators with 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 one peer-reviewed publication in most calendar years (an average of at least three peer reviewed publications over the three calendar years).

- Clinician Investigators must also clearly indicate in their CVs and Annual Review Forms their roles on all publications.
- **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, Provincial, National or International peer-reviewed conferences each calendar year (presenting or co-presenting on average at least once per year). The presentation may take the form of an oral presentation, poster presentation or workshop. For mid and senior career Clinician Investigators, the expectation is that these presentations will be at the National or International levels with senior Clinician Investigators having at least one invited/keynote presentation in a three-year period.
  - Clinician Investigators must also clearly indicate in their CVs and Annual Review Forms their roles on all peer-reviewed presentations and specify the type (oral presentation, poster presentation, workshop, invited/keynote presentation) and audience (Local, Provincial, National, International).
- **Other Knowledge Translation/Dissemination Activities:**
  - Clinician Investigators should make an effort to engage in knowledge translation/dissemination activities, in addition to the traditional peer-review mechanism, to reach a wider audience for whom the research is relevant.
  - The Clinician Investigator must address the following question in the Annual Review Form:
    - What activities did you engage in to disseminate your research to relevant audiences beyond the traditional peer review mechanisms?
- **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.
  - Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award in 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 NEW INVESTIGATORS

- New Investigators are DFCM faculty members who are both active clinicians and primary care researchers who are within five years of receiving their highest academic degree. The purpose of this award is to provide protected research time (for up to three years) for recent graduates (preferably those with PhDs who are wanting to become Clinician Scientists) in order for them to improve their track records as primary care researchers and ultimately make them more competitive for peer-reviewed funding and other career awards.
- The criteria listed below for evaluating New Investigators will take into account both their stage of career and percentage of protected time for research. These criteria are consistent with the requirements for academic promotion.
- All New Investigators must have one or more formal research mentors.

## 5.1 Required Academic Contributions

- **Evidence of Research Mentorship and Graduate Student Supervisory Roles:**
  - Must have a formal mentorship role in support of one or more DFCM faculty members.
  - New Investigators, particularly those with  $\geq 50\%$  protected time for research are encouraged to apply for a SGS appointment before their award ends in order that they can transition into supervisory roles on graduate student thesis committees.
- **Participation in DFCM Activities:**
  - Must attend more than 50% of DFCM City Wide Research Rounds, attend the DFCM Conference each year, and present at one of these activities at least once in a three-year period and participate in other DFCM activities (e.g., be judge for the DFCM Resident Academic Project Day).
- **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. This collaboration should be in keeping with the goals and objectives of the DFCM Investigator Award.
    - *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 Research Collaboration with UTOPIAN**
  - Must show evidence of a meaningful research collaboration with UTOPIAN.
- **Evidence of Research Leadership/Administrative Activities**
  - New Investigators with  $\geq 50\%$  protected time for research are encouraged to take on or share one or more research leadership/administrative roles typically at the Site/Local level. Other examples include membership on graduate studies admissions committees, peer-review committees such as for FMF submissions, Janus grants or CIHR grants.
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Family Medicine Teaching Units/Divisions:**
  - Must be associated with one of the DFCM's family medicine teaching units or similar DFCM-related research groups (e.g., SREMI, UTOPIAN) and show evidence of participation in their committee meetings, discussion groups and rounds.
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Research and Advocacy 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 increased the research capacity of the DFCM and made an impact on clinical practice, policy, teaching, research etc., at the Local, Provincial, National and/or International levels.

## 5.2 Required Research Productivity

- **Grants and Contracts:**
  - New Investigators must hold at least one active grant or contract as a PI, Co-PI or Co-Investigator (preferably peer-reviewed grants) in each calendar year and submit applications for as needed to ensure that at least one grant or contract is held at all times as PI, Co-PI or Co-Investigator.
  - New Investigators must address the relevance to family medicine/primary care of each of their research grants, contracts and their programs of research in the Annual Review Form.
  - New Investigators must also clearly indicate in their CVs and Annual Review Forms their roles on all grants and contracts.
- **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 of value and should be reported but are not considered original research for the purpose of this research productivity review.
  - New Investigators should be aiming for the “best” journals in their respective fields.
  - New Investigators must address the relevance to family medicine/primary care of each of their research publications in the Annual Review Form.
  - New Investigators with  $\leq 60\%$  protected research time are expected to have at least two peer-reviewed publications in most calendar years (an average of at least six peer-reviewed publications over the three-year period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018. The next three-year period will begin January 1, 2019 (or for new award recipients, the year in which they first received the award).
  - Of the above six publications, at least two are expected to be as first author.
  - New Investigators with  $>60\%$  protected research time are expected to have at least three peer-reviewed publication in most calendar years (an average of at least nine peer-reviewed publications over the three calendar years, at least three of which are expected to be as first author).
  - New Investigators must also clearly indicate in their CVs and Annual Review Forms their roles on all publications.
- **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 National or International peer-reviewed conferences each calendar year (presenting or co-presenting on average at least once per year). The presentation may take the form of an oral presentation, poster presentation or workshop.
  - New Investigators must also clearly indicate in their CVs and Annual Review Forms their roles on all peer-reviewed presentations and specify the type (oral presentation, poster presentation, workshop, invited/keynote presentation) and audience (Local, Provincial, National, International).

- **Other Knowledge Translation/Dissemination Activities:**
  - Clinician Investigators should make an effort to engage in knowledge translation/dissemination activities, in addition to the traditional peer review mechanism, to reach a wider audience for whom the research is relevant.
  - The Clinician Investigator must address the following question in the Annual Review Form:
    - What activities did you engage in to disseminate your research to relevant audiences beyond the traditional peer review mechanisms?
- **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.
  - Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award in 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

## 6.0 ANNUAL REVIEW CRITERIA FOR GRADUATE RESEARCH STUDIES

- Graduate Research Studies award recipients are DFCM faculty members (or equivalent) who are active primary care clinicians who are enrolled in graduate degree research programs. These awards are for up to five years if enrolled in a relevant PhD program and two years if enrolled in a relevant Master's degree program.
- All Graduate Research Studies award holders must have one or more formal research mentors.

## 6.1 Required Contributions to the DFCM

- **Participation in DFCM Activities:**
  - Must attend more than 50% of DFCM City Wide Research Rounds, attend the DFCM Conference each year, and present at one of these activities at least once in a two-year period and where appropriate participate in other DFCM activities (e.g., be a judge for the DFCM Resident Academic Project Day).
- **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. This collaboration should be in keeping with the goals and objectives of the DFCM Investigator Award.
    - *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 Research Collaboration with UTOPIAN:**
  - Must show evidence of a meaningful research collaboration with UTOPIAN.
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Family Medicine Teaching Units/Divisions:**
  - Must be associated with one of the DFCM's family medicine teaching units or similar DFCM-related research groups (e.g., SREMI, UTOPIAN) and show evidence of participation in their committee meetings, discussion groups and rounds.
- **Evidence of Contribution to the DFCM Research and Advocacy 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.

## 6.2 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 research degree program (e.g., course work, thesis proposal acceptance, thesis defense date) and a proposed timeline for completion.
  - Graduate Research Studies award recipients must address the relevance of their graduate research project to family medicine/primary care in their Annual Review Form.
- **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, Provincial, National or International peer-reviewed conferences each calendar year (presenting or co-presenting at least once in a two-year period). The presentation may take the form of an oral presentation, poster presentation or workshop.
  - Graduate Research Studies award recipients must clearly indicate in their CVs and Annual Review Forms their roles on all peer-reviewed presentations and specify the type

(oral presentation, poster presentation, workshop, invited/keynote presentation) and audience (Local, Provincial, National, International).

- *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, Provincial, National, International).*

- **Other Knowledge Translation/Dissemination Activities:**

- Graduate Research Studies award holders should make an effort to engage in knowledge translation/dissemination activities, in addition to the traditional peer-review mechanism, to reach a wider audience for whom the research is relevant.
- The Graduate Research Studies award holder must address the following question in the Annual Review Form:
  - What activities did you engage in to disseminate your research to relevant audiences beyond the traditional peer-review mechanisms?

- **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.
- Must acknowledge their DFCM Investigator Award in 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