

MICHR TRANSLATIONAL SCIENCE AWARD
Community-Based Participatory Research Approach
Eligibility Requirements, Application Guidelines, and Review Criteria

Definition of Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR): CBPR equitably involves community and academic partners in all aspects of the research process. CBPR partnerships form around a research topic of relevance to the communities involved with the aim of combining knowledge and action for social change to improve health and reduce health inequities. Learn about CBPR [here](#). Applications must meet 4 requirements:

- Include at least 2 eligible investigators on the research team: 1 academic and 1 community investigator.
- Clearly show that the research topic is a health priority of the community partner organization(s) and describe how the focal community was engaged in identifying the topic.
- Allocate at least 50% of requested funds to community investigators and non-academic partners.
- Provide letters of support from each community partner organization involved.

AWARD INFORMATION:

Duration: One year

Budget: MICHR will provide a maximum of \$30,000 for projects with one community partner and a maximum of \$40,000 for projects with two or more community partners. Cost-share is not required; however, academic applicants are encouraged to explore the potential for securing additional funding support from your U-M department/unit or other institutional entities, such as NIH-funded institutes and centers.

Roles & Eligibility: All active U-M faculty are eligible to apply as Principal Investigator (PI). For more information about faculty designations, see page 4. All community partners affiliated with a non-academic community organization (e.g. nonprofit, government health agency, federally qualified health center) are eligible to serve as Co-PI. Community and academic partners may serve as individual PIs or Co-PIs, as long as the partnership demonstrates collaboration and shared leadership among all partners involved. Community partners who do not have an organizational affiliation may serve as collaborators, consultants, mentors, and other prominent roles for the project.

Restrictions: You can submit a maximum of one application per round. No more than two separate pilot grants (>\$25K) can be held by one Principle Investigator during a 5-year period. Multiple proposals (>\$25K) cannot be active at the same time. The MICHR Pilot Grant Program cannot accept applications proposing research conducted abroad because NIH-National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS) will not provide prior approval for such pilot grants. In addition, NIH-NCATS only permits funding of clinical trials through the end of Phase IIA, with the exception of certain activities involving treatment of a rare disease or condition. For questions, contact the [Pilot Grant Program](#).

Resubmissions: A maximum of 2 resubmissions are allowed (i.e. A1 and A2).

Timelines: If your application is deemed fundable by the MICHR Scientific Review Committee, and it proposes human subjects or vertebrate animal research, it must proceed to a second level of review by NIH-NCATS. NIH-NCATS approval must be obtained before funds are released. From the time you are notified of your fundable score by the Pilot Grant Program, you will have four months to submit your protocol to the IRB or IACUC and six months to obtain approval. If approval is not obtained within this timeframe, the Pilot Grant Program reserves the right to deny funding.

APPLICATION DEADLINE: Tuesday, February 13, 2018 at 5:00pm

APPLICATION SUBMISSION:

Submit applications in [UMMS Competition Space](#). Use provided forms and templates when applicable.

APPLICATION COMPONENTS:

Face Page and Project Summary: Complete using form in Competition Space. The project summary (250-word maximum) should be written using language that can be understood by a non-scientific audience.

Other Support: Include for all investigators with the titles Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator, or Co-Investigator. Use current NIH format form in Competition Space.

Application: Use template(s) provided in Competition Space and combine into one PDF for submission.

Format specifications: Arial, size 11, single-spaced, and ½-inch margins.

1. Rebuttal (1-page limit, template in Competition Space): Required for resubmissions.
2. Proposal Narrative (page limits and suggested section lengths below, template in Competition Space).
 - A. Specific Aims (1-page limit): Concisely and realistically describe the goals of the proposed research, the specific objectives and hypotheses to be tested, the expected outcomes, the expected impact on the field, and the potential for improving community health.
 - *6-page limit for sections B-H*
 - B. Background and Significance* (~0.5 pages, follow NIH criteria):
 - Describe the importance of the specific health issue that the partnership will address and its relevance to the communities involved. Describe the extent of community involvement in identifying the priority health issue.
 - Describe the scientific premise for the proposed project, including the strengths and weaknesses of published research or preliminary data crucial to support your application.
 - Explain how the proposed project will improve scientific knowledge, technical capability, clinical practice, and/or community-based intervention in one or more broad fields.
 - Describe how the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive the field will be changed if the proposed aims are achieved.
 - C. Innovation* (~0.5 pages, follow NIH criteria):
 - Explain how the application challenges and seeks to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms.
 - Describe any novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions to be developed or used, and any advantage over existing methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions.
 - Explain any refinements, improvements, or new applications of theoretical concepts, approaches, or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions.
 - D. Previous Related Work* (~0.5 pages):
 - Describe the experience and expertise that both community and academic partners bring to the project and evidence of the feasibility to accomplish the proposed aims.
 - Describe the roles and responsibilities of each partner involved and the history, if any, that partners have collaborating in prior research.
 - Preliminary data are not required when submitting an application. However, an explanation for the absence of preliminary data is helpful to the reviewers.

- E. Approach* (~3.5 pages, follow NIH criteria):
- Provide an overview of the experimental design.
 - Describe the methods and analyses to be used to accomplish the aims of the project.
 - Explain how community and academic partners will be involved in study design and implementation.
 - Discuss potential difficulties and limitations and how these will be overcome or mitigated.
 - Describe expected results and any alternative approaches that will be used if unexpected results are found.
- F. Timeline* (~0.25 pages): Describe plans for dissemination and when key research activities, including milestones that will be used to assess progress, will be accomplished during the award year. Include plans for disseminating findings to the communities involved.
- G. Impact Statement and Future Plan* (~0.5 pages): Describe the goal(s) of the specific research proposed and the broad, long-term objectives.
- H. Statement of Future Impact on Patient Care and/or the Community* (~0.25 pages): Describe how this research will impact patient care and/or the community in the future.

Additional Proposal Narrative Components (not included in 6-page limit for B-H):

- I. Animal Model (if applicable; no page limit):
- Provide reasoning of how the study will lead to “next step” research in humans. The research “next step” is the transition from the pre-clinical model to humans.
 - Studies are eligible for pilot grant funding when the animal model has already been validated as a predictor of how human disease will respond and the pathway toward humans is clearly evident as the next logical step.
 - Studies are not eligible if the animal model has not yet been validated; if a significant amount of work will be required to determine if the animal model would serve as a predictive model for human disease; and/or if human studies are not evident as the next logical step following completion of the proposed pilot grant research.
 - **If your application receives a fundable score, you will be required to provide additional vertebrate animal information and approvals.**
- J. Human Subjects (if applicable; no page limit):
- Follow the [NIH guidelines](#). Note that you must adhere to the updated instructions associated with FORMS-E):
 1. Protection of Human Subjects
 2. Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children
 3. Recruitment and Retention Plan
 4. Planned Enrollment Table
 - **If your application receives a fundable score, you will be required to provide additional human subjects documentation and IRB approval.**
 - Applicants proposing to recruit participants are encouraged to meet with [MICHR’s Participant Recruitment Program](#) prior to submission. Awardees proposing to recruit participants will be **required** to meet with MICHR’s Participant Recruitment Program before funding is released.
 - CBPR applicants are encouraged to meet with MICHR’s [Community Engagement Program](#) to discuss community-engaged strategies prior to submission. CBPR awardees will be **required** to meet with the Community Engagement Program within the first month of the project.

- K. Mentoring Plan (0.5-page limit; required for Early Career faculty only, see page 4): Describe the mentoring plan, which must include one or more established clinical, translational, or community-engaged research investigators. Include information about your mentor(s) and the purpose and goals of the mentoring relationship.
- L. New Research Direction (0.5-page limit; required for Established faculty only, see page 4): Provide a clear explanation of how the current proposal is a new research direction for the PI.
- M. References (no page limit)
3. Budget and Justification: Complete using form in Competition Space.
- Budget and justification must reflect the total budget (MICHR and matching).
 - Budget must allocate at least half (50%) of the requested funds to the community investigators and non-academic organization partners involved in the project.
 - The Academic PI must devote a minimum of 5% effort to the project (in-kind or charged to project).
 - Faculty salaries are allowable on the budget but cannot exceed 10% for Principal Investigators. For Co-Principal Investigators, the combined effort charged to the grant cannot exceed 10%. Faculty salary requests must adhere to the [PHS salary cap](#).
 - Include all personnel in the justification, regardless of whether salary support is requested. Provide a clear explanation for all personnel by position, the role they will play on the project, and the level of effort (if applicable). In most cases, positions labeled “TBD” will not be accepted.
 - Unallowable budget items: Subcontracts with associated facilities and administrative costs, equipment, cost overruns, retroactive funding, grant preparation costs, graduate student stipends and tuition costs, salary support for Fellows already funded by Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education program, travel unrelated to the conduct of the research (e.g. conferences), renovations, office supplies, and computers. This list may not be comprehensive, and the MICHR Pilot Grant Program reserves the right to deem costs unallowable. If you believe a cost listed above is necessary for the conduct of your research and should be allowed, preapproval must be secured. In most cases, exceptions are not approved.
4. Biographical Sketches: Include a current [NIH-style biosketch](#) for each investigator with the role of Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator, and Co-Investigator. Community investigators should provide a current resume or curriculum vitae in place of the biosketch.
5. Letters of Support: Applicants must provide letters of support from each community partner organization involved. These letters should address the interest and commitment to engage in the proposed research. It is strongly encouraged to provide a letter of support for any in-kind support included in the application.
6. Signature Page: Use form in Competition Space. Sign-off by the department, school, or center is required for the Principal Investigator and Co-Principal Investigator(s) to indicate agreement of the application budget, faculty effort, and cost-sharing arrangement. Sign-off is also required for the following scenarios:
- All faculty effort, regardless of role.
 - All matching/cost-share sources (e.g. multiple departments, center, or other institutional entity).
Note: When the number of applications receiving meritorious scores from the Scientific Review Committee exceeds the available cost-share dollars from a department, the department will have the final approval of which proposals will be funded.
7. Appendix (20-page limit): Follow NIH guidelines. Do not use the appendix to circumvent application page limits.

OTHER INFORMATION:

MICHR Pilot Grant Program Definition of Early Career and Established Faculty:

Early Career Investigator is defined as a faculty member with an appointment at the level of Assistant Professor (or the equivalent) and below, and includes: Lecturer, Instructor, Clinical Instructor, Research Investigator, Assistant Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Research Assistant Professor, or Assistant Research Scientist.

Established Investigator is defined as a faculty member with an appointment above the level of Assistant Professor (or equivalent), and includes: Associate Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Research Associate Professor, Associate Research Scientist, Professor, Clinical Professor, Research Professor, or Research Scientist.

Endowment for Basic Sciences:

The [Endowment for Basic Sciences \(EBS\)](#) and MICHR have partnered to fund T1 research that aims to foster the translation of innovative discoveries in molecular-, cell-, or animal-based models, or in the creation of novel technology platforms that have direct clinical potential for altering our understanding or management of human disease. For consideration of funding, **collaboration between a basic scientist from an EBS unit and a clinical investigator holding an appointment in a department/unit/center outside EBS is required.** Participating EBS units can be found [here](#)

APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION:

The MICHR Pilot Grant Program requires all applicants to adhere to the eligibility requirements and application guidelines in order to promote a process whereby submitted grant applications are evaluated on the basis of a process that is fair, equitable, timely, and free of bias. The Scientific Review Committee will determine whether your proposal meets the goals of the Pilot Grant Program and will evaluate your proposal for evidence of quality, accountability, and soundness of design. The core values of peer review drive MICHR to seek the highest level of ethical standards. The following main points will be considered:

1. **Significance:** Does this study address a problem or barrier to progress that is viewed as a priority by members of the community, especially the people that the study is designed to include? Does the study seek to improve health outcomes among populations which are more likely to experience worse clinical and health care outcomes? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and or/clinical practice be improved? How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?
2. **Investigators:** Is there appropriate involvement of both academic and community investigators on the project? Do they have the complementary experience and the necessary skills to carry out the proposed research? Are the Principle Investigators, Co-Investigators, Collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If Early Stage Investigators (see page 4), do they have the appropriate experience and training, and is a mentoring program with an established investigator outlined? If the Principle Investigator is an Established Investigator (see page 4), is the proposed work a departure from prior research? Does the team have complementary and integrated expertise, and is their leadership approach, governance, and organizational structure appropriate for the project?
3. **Innovation:** Is there potential for this project to develop novel concepts, approaches, methodologies, tools, technologies, instrumentation, or interventions in the relevant field(s). Are these aspects novel to the field(s) of research or unique to the local community involved?
4. **Approach:** Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Have both community and academic partners identified potential barriers to successful completion of the study and plans for overcoming them? Does the project use the appropriate methods to engage and work with the community throughout the research process? For research not directly involving humans, have they clearly described how the next step in the overall research program will be translated into human-based or clinical research?
5. **Environment:** Will the research benefit from the unique features of the scientific or community environment(s) where the research will be conducted? Is there evidence of community support for the project through letters of support? Is there potential for the communities and community partners to benefit from the presence and implementation of the research? Will the scientific environment contribute to the probability of success? Are the institutional support, equipment, and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed? Is the proposed budget and available resources fully justified and adequate to complete the work in the proposed time period? Is the distribution of funds between community and academic partners clear, fair, and appropriate?
6. **Program:** Does the application meet the objectives of the CBPR approach (see page 1) and goals of the Pilot Grant Program? Including, but not limited to:
 - To drive translation of scientific concepts from the benches of basic scientists to clinical investigators and from the bedside to community practice.
 - To stimulate research that addresses community-identified health priorities.
 - To positively impact clinical and community health outcomes.

7. **Translation:** Is there a clear and viable plan for disseminating research findings? Does the plan describe how findings will be shared with the communities and participants involved? What is the likelihood the project will lead to sustained efforts to apply research findings in clinical or community-based settings and/or funding to support future collaborative projects?
8. **Patient/Community Consideration:** Does the applicant clearly describe how the proposed research will impact patients and/or the community in the future?

Additional considerations:

- Has the potential overlap with other projects been adequately addressed?
- Did the applicant consider **biostatistics** in the proposal? (We encourage you to confer with a biostatistician as you develop your proposed study.)

A patient advisor or community member will be included in the review of the proposal.

The Scientific Review Committee scores applications using the NIH 1-9 point scale:

Score	Guidance on Strengths and Weaknesses	Descriptor	Impact
1	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses	Exceptional	High
2	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses	Outstanding	
3	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses	Excellent	
4	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses	Very Good	Medium
5	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness	Good	
6	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses	Satisfactory	
7	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness	Fair	Low
8	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses	Marginal	
9	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses	Poor	

CONTACT:

MICHR-PilotGrants@umich.edu

734.998.7308

[TRANSLATIONAL SCIENCE AWARD WEBPAGE](#)