

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 50 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: NIH, Project Clearance Branch, 6705 Rockledge Drive, MSC 7974, Bethesda, MD 20892-7974, ATTN: PRA (0925-XXXX). Do not return the completed form to this address.

Key Informant Interview Guide – Outside Experts (*External Investigators*)

Interview Information

Interviewee:		
Title:		
Interview Format	<input type="checkbox"/> In-person	<input type="checkbox"/> Phone <input type="checkbox"/> Skype/video chat
Phone/Email:		
Video chat ID:	Skype:	GooglePlus:
Date:	Start time:	End time:
Interviewer:		

Introduction

Opening Script: Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. My name is _____, and I am with Concept Systems, Inc. We are an evaluation firm that has been contracted to conduct an evaluation of the NHLBI Proteomics Centers Program (which I will refer to as "the Program" from now on).

The overall goals of the evaluation are to better understand the contributions of the Program and the experiences of the Program staff and affiliates. As we go through the interview, you may feel that you don't have enough direct knowledge of the Program to answer some of my questions. However, please note that we are interested in your *opinions and perceptions* of the program and its impact, based on your role in the field.

This evaluation is being performed with the understanding that each Center within the Program is unique based on its areas of concentration. To that end, the findings of the evaluation will not be used to compare individual Centers.

This interview is designed to take about 45-50 minutes, though you are welcome to continue our discussion beyond that time if you choose. I will take notes during the interview and, with your permission, I will also audio record the interview. This project is not research and does not require IRB review. However, your participation in this interview is voluntary. You have the option of ending the interview at any time, and you are also free to skip any questions that you would prefer not to answer.

Please note that this evaluation only covers the past five years of the NHLBI Proteomics Centers Program, from 2010 to 2015. If you were involved in previous iterations of this program, please make sure that your responses to my questions reflect your experience only over the past five years.

The information you provide will not be disclosed to anyone but the researchers conducting the study, except otherwise required by law. With that said, are you willing to continue with the interview? [YES/NO]. And is it okay if I audio record the interview? [YES/NO]

Do you have any questions before we begin? Let's get started.

Background Questions

Script: First, I want to gather some basic information about your role and position.

1. Please verify the following background information:

Title:	
Center/Organization:	

2. In what capacity have you worked with the Program, or how are you familiar with the Program?

3. In responding to my questions, please remember that we are focused only on the past 5 years of the Program. Has your role with the Program changed during that time? _____

4. Very briefly, how would you describe your current role? _____

Section A: Scientific Advancements & Influence of the Program

Script: I would like to begin by asking you some questions about the scientific advancements made through the Program over the past five years, and the influence of the Program in the fields of proteomics and heart, lung, and blood research.

5. When you consider the work of the Program, what, if any, significant discoveries or advancements have emerged from the Program that you would consider to be significant in the fields or proteomics and/or heart, lung, and blood research?

- a. How, if at all, would you say these discoveries have influenced proteomics and heart, lung, and blood research?

--

6. In what ways, if at all, has the work done through the Program contributed to our understanding of the connections between proteomes and the molecular phenotypes of disease?

- a. In what ways, if at all, has the Program contributed to our understanding of the underlying mechanisms of heart, lung, and blood disease biology?

--

7. How, if at all, has the Program contributed to the development of knowledge or tools relevant to clinical or translational questions in the field?

8. How, if at all, has the Program advanced the field toward the development of mature technologies that are applicable to clinical outcomes, and what remains to be done?

9. Thinking about the field as a whole, how would you describe the next steps needed in terms of clinical applications of proteomic research?

10. How would you characterize the capacity of the field for innovative research as compared to five years ago?

- a. In your opinion, how, if at all, has the Program increased the capacity of the field as a whole to engage in innovative HLB research?

11. In what ways, if at all, has the Program raised the profile of proteomics research?

- a. Relative to other work being done in the field, how influential has the work of this Program been, in your opinion? For example, would you say that it is on par with the field, leading the field, or lagging behind the rest of the field?

Section B: Application & Dissemination of New Knowledge and Tools

Script: Great. Now I am going to ask you about the application and dissemination of knowledge and tools developed through the Program.

12. In your work, how, if at all, have you used new knowledge or tools that were developed through the Program?

- a. How or through what channels did you access new knowledge and tools developed through the Program?

13. In what ways, if at all, have you seen knowledge, methods, or tools that emerged from the Program applied by other researchers, or applied elsewhere in the field?

14. In what ways, if any, had you expected or anticipated tools developed by the Program to be made available to the broader research community, that were not realized?

Section C: Collaboration

Script: My next questions focus on the role and nature of collaborations associated with the Program.

15. In what ways, if any, have you or your colleagues collaborated with researchers involved in the Program?

- a. How would you characterize these collaborations (for example, the type, number, and quality)?
- b. Of the collaborations in which you were involved, how many represented new collaborative relationships? Previously activated collaborative relationships?

16. In what ways, if any, do you intend to leverage or build on these collaborations going forward?

17. Now I would like to ask about more formal collaborative relationships that may have developed between the Program and other centers or researchers in the field. In what ways, if any, have you or your colleagues engaged in formal collaborations that involved working collectively with researchers from the Program to achieve a common goal?

- a. How would you describe the nature of those collaborations?
- b. In your opinion, how valuable were these collaborations for your work? For example, would you say that they were instrumental to your work, generally productive, or generally unproductive?
- c. What plans, if any, do you have for future formal collaborations that have stemmed from your work with researchers in the Program?

Section D: Recognition & Advancement

Script: My final questions focus on the recognition and professional advancement of researchers involved in the Program.

18. I am going to ask you to consider the work and standing of the lead investigators involved in the Program. Relative to other leading investigators in the field, how would you characterize the leading investigators who are involved with the Program?

a. For example, would you say they are on par with other investigators, exceptional in the field, or lagging behind other senior investigators in the field?

19. In the past five years, what, if any, major conference or keynote presentations that were based on the work of the Program stand out as being particularly significant in your mind?

a. Please describe the context and content of the presentations (who, where, what was it about, why it was significant).

20. That is the last of my formal questions. Before we close, is there anything about the Centers or the Program that you feel is important for us to know, that I didn't ask about?

Closing Remarks

Script: Thank you again for taking time out of your schedule to participate in this study. We will be using the data we collect through these interviews to inform our evaluation of the Program. If, after revisiting our interview, I have questions for clarification, is it okay if I contact you again? [YES/NO]

Great. Thank you again for your time. Please feel free to contact us if you have any follow-up questions or comments.

Interviewer notes

Methodological comments

- How did the process go? What worked well? What didn't?
- Functionality of or issues with the technology

- Observations on the questions/guide: (Redundancy; Flow; Specificity/generalality of the questions)
- Other

Analytical comments

- Thoughts/observations on the content of the interview
- Themes or connection
- Demeanor of interviewee
- Key new information
- Other