Society of Professors
of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry

2013 Research Survey

1. Approximately what percent of faculty involved in research receives protected research time funded by the Department/Division?

	Response %	Response # (n=33)
None	27.3%	9
1-10%	48.5%	16
11-20%	9.1%	3
>21%	15.2%	5

2. Approximately how much protected research time (funded by the Department/Division is provided to these faculty members?

	Response %	Response # (n=32)
None	28.1%	9
1-10%	50.0%	16
11-20%	12.5%	4
>21%	9.4%	3

3. What factors does the Department/Division use to determine who gets protected research time?

	Response %	Response #
--Individual's potential	63.3%	19
--Individual's track record of obtaining funding	46.7%	14
--Individual's seniority	6.7%	2
--High score on submitted grant & likely funding	30.0%	9
--Other, specified below	33.3%	10

No funded research time; Availability of funds;

No protected time for unfunded research; Need funding source

4. Under what conditions does the Department/Division provide protected research time?

	Response %	Response # (n=32)
--No funded protected research time provided	34.4%	11
--Funded protected research time provided on an ongoing basis as part of the staff member's job description	37.5%	12
--Funded protected research time provided as gap or bridge funding	28.1%	9

5. If the Department/Division provides gap or bridge funding for researchers, how long does it last on average?

	Response %	Response # (n=32)
No gap or bridge funding	46.9%	15
<3 months	3.1%	1
> 3 & ≤6 months	15.6%	5
>6 & <12 months	25.0%	8
>12 months	9.4%	3

6. How do you provide mentorship support to junior level researchers? (check all that apply)

	Response %	**Response #**
--No formal mentorship	6.1%	2
--1:1 mentor assignment	69.7%	23
--Research group mentorship	60.6%	20
--Research career meetings with Department/Division leaders (at least annual)	60.6%	20
--Informal mentorship through shared lab interactions	48.5%	16
--Informal contacts	66.7%	22

7. How do you review grant proposals prior to submission? (check all that apply)

	Response %	Response #
--No formal review process	21.9&	7
--Informal review, driven by submitter	43.8%	14
--Abstract reviewed by senior researcher	3.1%	1
--Entire application reviewed by senior researcher	34.4%	11
--Department committee review	25.0%	8
--Division committee review	9.4%	3
--Department/Division chief review	25.0%	8

8. Please rank how you prioritize the following options for researcher development in your Department/Division (1 highest priority and 5 lowest priority):

	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Rating Count
Identifying and nurturing promising junior faculty	57.6% (19)	30.3% (10)	9.1% (3)	3.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.58	33
Fostering mentor support	12.1% (4)	42.4% (14)	24.2% (8)	15.2% (5)	6.1% (2)	2.61	33
Protected research time	18.2% (6)	15.2% (5)	30.3% (10)	24.2% (8)	12.1% (4)	2.97	33
Reviewing grant proposals	6.1% (2)	3.0% (1)	30.3% (10)	39.4% (13)	21.2% (7)	3.67	33
Gap funding	6.1% (2)	9.1% (3)	6.1% (2)	18.2% (6)	60.6% (20)	4.18	33

9. Please list/discuss any other "high priority" strategies you provide for researcher development in your Department/Division:

Have identified lack of resources & mentors as a deficit to departmental & institutional leadership as a critical issue.

Fortunate to receive a gift from a grateful patient's family that has allowed us to fund some pilot projects for junior and mid-career faculty

Mentoring with senior researchers with a Track Record

Funds are available at the University level for research and bridging or gap funding, not at the Division level unless the junior faculty gets salary support from a funded investigator's grant.

Our CTSI and PCRC provide additional resources to help researchers complete successful grant applications. Our university has fairly good internal grants from donor money and other sources that are competitively awarded twice a year.

Our research funding is somewhat fictitious. It is given on a very grudging basis. Only if a senior member fights on behalf of a junior member would it happen. It rarely does happen though I have one colleague for whom I have been successful.

Recently the CRI (Children's Research Center) has asked Division Chief's to identify one researcher of mid-senior level who will get 20% protected time by the CRI to foster and mentor research activities of junior colleagues. Then 20% of their goals are measured by how productive they have been in mentoring and getting others to write, submit and/or get funding. No cost to the Department!

mentorship is far and away the most important issue once a promising young investigator has been identified

We are a tiny division with a tiny amount of research-- I am very interested in the findings from your survey, which may inform my own efforts to create more support for research here.

Facilitation of national networking for young faculty and also collaborations within the hospital with funded researchers in other departments

Research track for fellows

Discretionary Chair/Endowed Professorships

It is a developmental process that depends on the circumstances, size, and focus of the division. Money is tightening up and standards for funding are raising

My goodness

1) over 75% of our Departments/Divisions fund 10% or less of their faculty for research

2) Over 78% of our faculty receive 4 hours or less of protected research time.