

Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center | New Mexico State University
Partnership for the Advancement of Cancer Research
U54 Collaborative Grant

CALL FOR PROPOSALS, 2010

Release Date: September, 2009

Funding Available: Funds are available for three different levels of collaborative research in 2010: pre-pilot, pilot, and full projects or programs. This U54 collaboration seeks diversity in its PI's, in addition to projects that make the partnership sustainable and result in the training of underrepresented students and/or work toward eliminating cancer health disparities. Investigators with or without currently-funded projects through the U54 are eligible to apply for a pre-pilot, pilot or full proposal.

- *Pre-pilots will be accepted for projects that have the potential to develop into U54 pilots, U54 full projects, or small NIH grants. These awards are for a 1-year period for up to \$7,500 in direct costs shared between the FHCRC and NMSU.
- Pilot proposals will be accepted for projects or programs that have the potential to develop into U54 full projects or small NIH grants. These awards are for a 2-year period for up to \$108,000 in direct annual costs shared between the FHCRC and NMSU. Please note: Proposal funds must be spent by August 2012.
- Full proposals will be accepted for projects or programs that have the potential to develop into NIH R21 or R01 grants. These awards are for a 2-year period for up to \$247,500 in direct annual costs shared between the FHCRC and NMSU. Please note: Proposal funds must be spent by August 2012.

*Pre-pilots are proposals for small grants that have the potential to lead to a pilot project in the U54. Pre-pilots offer time and resources to gather very preliminary information on the feasibility of a project that may play a greater role in the U54. Examples include, but are not limited to, building bridges with other entities (e.g., the University Extension Service, Oncology nursing), assessing the feasibility of acquiring data or samples (e.g., border clinics), and/or exploring basic science projects that can be done at NMSU. All pre-pilot projects should have high potential for leading to subsequent U54 pilot or full funding or through NIH pilots such as R03 or R21 mechanisms.

Proposal Requirements

- All funded projects must have a minimum of two co-PIs; one from NMSU, the other from the FHCRC;
- Pre-pilot, pilot, and full projects must include a career development plan for junior research personnel (faculty, post-docs, graduate students, and undergraduates). A junior faculty person is someone who has not yet received an R-type grant.

Letter of Intent (Required) Due: March 26, 2010

Proposal Submission Due: May 3, 2010

Study Section Review: June/July 2010

Notice of Award: August 2010

Start Date: approximately September 2010

Project Background

The National Cancer Institute (NCI) has awarded funds to expand an existing collaboration between the FHCRC and NMSU. This collaboration is designed to enhance the opportunities of minorities and underrepresented individuals to become trained and experienced in cancer research. This five-year grant was awarded in September 2007 by the NCI's Comprehensive Minority Biomedical Branch (CMBB), which is

exploring a potentially powerful approach for addressing health disparities by funding collaborations between Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) and NCI-designated Cancer Centers (CCs). The partnership seeks to:

- Increase the capacity of NMSU to conduct competitive research;
- Create a long-standing partnership in cancer research training and education; and
- Evaluate a way to bring public health intervention to communities suffering from cancer health disparities.

The mechanism for accomplishing these goals is the development of interdisciplinary, collaborative research programs between NMSU and FHCRC scientists. Such research can include:

- Cancer research projects, including basic sciences, clinical cancer approaches, human biology;
- Undergraduate and/or graduate student training opportunities; and
- Cancer outreach to minorities

For more information

Details about potential collaborating scientists, examples of funded projects, and application forms can be found at cancer.nmsu.edu or www.fhcrc.org/science/pacr/. For more information, contact Dr. Mary O'Connell, Program Director at NMSU, via phone at: (575) 646-5172 or email at: moconnel@nmsu.edu or Dr. Beti Thompson, Program Director at FHCRC, via phone at: (206) 667-4673 or email at: bthompso@fhcrc.org.

Travel support for potential collaborators

The program has limited funds to support travel of potential applicants to visit potential collaborators in Seattle or Las Cruces. Please contact Lené Loest via phone at: (575) 646-5104 or email at: hloest@nmsu.edu or Jennifer Anderson via phone at: (206) 667-7480 or email at: janderso@fhcrc.org for travel assistance information.

A completed application will include:

1. Letter of Intent (LOI): due **March 26, 2010**, The LOI must include the following:

- Specific aims; and
- The names of the NMSU and FHCRC collaborators.

2. Proposal: due **May 3, 2010**. The proposal must include the following:

- NMSU/FHCRC Cover Page signed by each PI on the collaborating project;
- NIH PHS 398 form Page 2 (abstract);
- NIH PHS 398 Budget form page 4 and Justification form page 5, (each PI on the collaborating project needs an institution-specific budget, the total direct funds across both institutions should not exceed \$7,500/year for a pre-pilot; \$108,000/year for a pilot proposal or \$247,500/year for a full proposal. No pilot or full proposal will be funded for longer than two years). PI salaries will NOT be supported on pre-pilot awards. A 1 year budget is required for pre-pilot awards;
- NIH PHS 398 Biographical Sketch for each PI and any other key personnel;
- NIH PHS 398 Resources form for each PI (not needed for pre-proposal);
- A full project or program proposal may be funded at the level of a pilot proposal based on recommendations from the study section reviewers, Internal Advisory Committee, and/or Program Steering Committee. **As such, full projects or programs should include a contingency plan in the event they are funded at the pilot level. Specifically, the co-PIs should highlight the specific aims and research plan elements that could be completed under pilot funding;**
- Program Description for **pre-pilot**: (2 pages, PHS 398 continuation format pages) describing: purpose/ specific aims, sample, methods, data collection, data analysis, and information on how the proposed project is part of a line of research that will lead to future U54 or NIH funding.
 - A career development plan for all junior faculty, post-docs and graduate students, not included in 2-page limit (contact Lené or Jennifer for the career development template);

- Program Description for **pilot** or **full** project (15 pages, excluding references; PHS 398 continuation format pages);
 - A career development plan for all junior faculty, post-docs and graduate students, not included in 15-page limit (contact Lené or Jennifer for the career development template);
 - Strategies for developing/maintaining an active collaboration between the NMSU and FHCRC collaborators;
 - Indication of the added value the proposal brings to the U54 partnership;
- Any necessary IACUC, IBC or IRB certifications. (Address all issues pertaining to human subjects, animal care and use, biosafety or hazardous chemicals in the research narrative.);
- Partnership Agreement, up to 2 pages, not included in 15-page limit. Address how the co-PI's will prevent and resolve conflicts over intellectual property. You may refer to the NIH's discussion about partnership agreements for mentors and/or PI's at: <http://www.nih.gov/catalyst/2002/02.05.01/page6.html>

Submission Information

Please submit completed application electronically (including the signed cover page) to either Dr. Mary O'Connell, Program Director at NMSU, at: moconnel@nmsu.edu or Dr. Beti Thompson, Program Director at the FHCRC, at: bthomps@fhcrc.org. *Note: institutional sign-off is only required for funded applications.

Review Process

A study section comprised of scientists from NMSU, the FHCRC, and ad-hoc external investigators will review proposals that coincide with their scientific expertise and provide a written evaluation. All pre-pilots, pilot, and full proposals will be reviewed. The Internal Advisory Committee will help identify reviewers. The Program Steering Committee will review the written evaluations and advise the Program Directors on the final funding decisions.

Evaluation Criteria

The Study Section's proposal evaluation template is appended for your reference.

a. Evaluation Criteria for Pre-pilot projects:

- Scientific significance: How likely is the project to yield high-quality publications?
- Innovation.
- Compatibility with the U54 goals: To what extent does the project address development of collaborative programs of research? To what extent does the project build new bridges across programs or areas that could benefit from seed funding? To what extent does project offer training opportunities for students?
- Benefit of the project to investigator's career development: To what extent will the project benefit the investigators' career development? To what extent will the project allow the investigator to target high-need populations or new questions that have previously been under-studied?
- Likelihood that the pre-pilot will lead to pilot or full funding.

b. Evaluation Criteria for Pilot Projects:

- The qualifications of the co-Leaders from NMSU and the FHCRC to develop the proposed project/program;
- The merit and importance of the proposed pilot project/program and the degree to which it contributes to the priorities and objectives of the partnership;
- The adequacy of the career development and mentorship plan; and
- Potential to develop into a full project/program in 2 years or less;

c. Evaluation Criteria for Full Research Projects:

- Significance: Does this study address an important problem consistent with the objectives of the MI/CCP program? If the aims of the application are achieved, how will scientific knowledge be advanced? What will be the effect of these studies on the concepts or methods that drive this field of cancer research and/or research on cancer disparities?
- Approach: Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well-integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?
- Innovation: Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches or methods? Are the aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies?
- Investigator: Is the investigator appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the principal investigator and other researchers (if any)? Is the career development and mentorship plan adequate?
- Environment: Does the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Do the proposed experiments take advantage of unique features of the scientific environment or employ useful collaborative arrangements? Is there evidence of institutional support?

d. Evaluation Criteria for Pre-pilot, Pilot, and Full Programs (i.e., training, education, and/or outreach):

- The qualifications of the Co-Leaders from the MI and the Cancer Center to develop the proposed program;
- The appropriateness of the mentors as related to the level of education of the trainees;
- The objectives, design, and direction of the program;
- The merit of the proposed program and its relation to the goals and priorities of the overall partnership;
- Quality of the institutional environment (access to institutional resources, mentors' accessibility, etc.);
- The relationship of the program to other programs in the MI and the Cancer Center;
- Quality of the program evaluation and the tracking plans; and
- Potential of the proposed program to develop into a fundable program in the NIH peer review system or other agency.



EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS

Use a 1 - 9 rating for each of the following areas (1 – 2 = outstanding; 3 = excellent; 4 - 6 = average; 7 - 9 = poor). Reviewers should not only consider the relative number of strengths and weaknesses noted, but also the importance of these strengths and weaknesses to the criteria or to the overall impact when determining a score. For example, a major strength may outweigh many minor and correctable weaknesses. The table below provides additional guidance to assist reviewers in dete

IMPACT	SCORE	DESCRIPTOR	ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE ON STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES
High Impact	1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
	2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
	3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
Moderate Impact	4	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weakness
	5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
	6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
Low Impact	7	Fair	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
	8	Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
	9	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact. **Moderate Weakness:** A weakness that lessens impact. **Major Weakness:** A weakness that severely limits impact.

Project Title			
Investigators			
<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-pilot	<input type="checkbox"/> Pilot	<input type="checkbox"/> Full	

1. Scientific Approach	(score) Include significance, approach, innovation, etc.
Comments	

2. Feasibility	(score)
Comments	

3. Relevance	(score)
<i>To what extent might this project have an impact on cancer health disparities?</i>	

4. Compatibility with the U54 Goals	(score)
<i>To what extent does the project address development of collaborative programs of research (qualifications and partnership)?</i>	
<i>To what extent does the project focus on important questions in cancer or cancer prevention?</i>	
<i>Is the project likely to result in the recruitment and training of underrepresented students?</i>	

5. Future R01 Funding	(score) Is the project likely to lead to independent funding?
Comments	

6. Is the career development plan and mentorship of the junior investigator(s) (if applicable) appropriate for this proposal?	(score)
--	---------

Overall Score	
Summary Comments	