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**U54 Proposal Evaluation Template**

**Evaluation Instructions**

When reviewing proposals, please keep in mind the overall goals of this collaboration between New Mexico State University (NMSU) and the Fred Hutch, namely to expand the current cancer research infrastructure at NMSU and increase knowledge and attention to cancer-related health disparities at both Fred Hutch and NMSU. The partnership is guided by three specific aims to achieve this overall goal:

1. **Conduct a diverse portfolio of cancer research projects;**
2. **Maintain, strengthen, and evaluate our effective training programs for current and future underserved scientists; and**
3. **Implement cancer-related public health interventions in underserved communities.**

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 determining their ratings.

Please consider the prompts offered in the 8 categories below as you develop your evaluation; however you are **NOT** expected to respond to each question.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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** |  | | |
|  | | **Pilot** | **Full** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score** | Please give your **overall score** for the project: |
| **Overall Comments** | Provide a **rationale** for giving the score that you did. Summarize the **strengths** and **weaknesses** that led you to give that score. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** | **Significance** | **Score:**  *Discuss how the project addresses an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field. In what ways will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved as a result of this work?*  **Specific to NCI CPACHE U54 PAR:** What important cancer or health disparities problem is addressed? What is the potential effect of this project on changes in knowledge, opinion, and practices among members of the participating community? |
| **Comments** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2.** | **Investigators** | **Score:**  *Explain how Early Stage Investigators or New Investigators have appropriate experience, training, or mentorship to conduct the project. How have investigators demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? Do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise?*  **Specific to NCI CPACHE U54 PAR:** Does the investigator(s) have prior adequate training and experience in designing and implementing new research education programs that are culturally appropriate? |
| **Comments** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3.** | **Innovation** | **Score:**  *How does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms? Are novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions described?*  **Specific to NCI CPACHE U54 PAR:** What is the relevance of the new study design to underserved populations? How is the project being designed to be culturally relevant? If beneficial, how will the study have an impact? |
| **Comments** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4.** | **Approach** | **Score:**  *How will the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses accomplish the specific aims of the project? How are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented?*  **Specific to NCI CPACHE U54 PAR:** Does the applicant present strong arguments for the proposed study design as the best possible balance of scientific rigor, implementation constraints and ethical sensitivities of partners? Are the plans for the project adequately described and appropriate for the goals of the particular partnership? How sustainable is the intervention? Will the implementation of the project enhance the ability of the Partnership to more directly and successfully address the disproportionate cancer burden in racial and ethnic groups and socioeconomically disadvantaged populations? |
| **Comments** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5.** | **Environment** | **Score:**  *How will the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success?*  **Specific to NCI CPACHE U54 PAR:** How well do all the proposed efforts take advantage of the available infrastructure and existing resources of the proposed partnership? Is there evidence of sufficient institutional support for the proposed partnership across the participating institutions? Does the applicant indicate the degree and the extent to which both academic and community partners have collaborated in the past? Is the environment conducive for new and early stage investigators? |
| **Comments** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6.** | **Relevance** | **Score:**        *To what extent might this project have an impact on cancer health disparities?*  *Compatibility with U54 goals?* |
| **Comments** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7.** | **Future Funding** | **Score:**  *Have the PIs proposed a realistic plan to advance this research project to be competitive for additional funding?* |
| **Comments** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8.** | **Progress Report** (if applicable) | **Score:**  *Has the prior support allowed any junior investigators to develop their career; has significant progress been demonstrated in publications, grants and student training?* |
| **Comments** |  |