



Introduction to CRC Application and Review Process

Marj Plumb, DrPH
Application Teleconferences

Senaida Fernandez, Ph.D.
Manager, Community Research Initiatives
California Breast Cancer Research Program
University of California Office of the President
300 Lakeside Drive, 6th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612-3550
Phone (510) 987-0491
Fax (510) 587-6325
Email Senaida.Fernandez@ucop.edu

1

Outline of Presentation

- Background on CBCRP and CRC Awards
- Application and Application Review Process



2

Background on CBCRP and CRC Awards

- Passage of The Breast Cancer Act of 1993
- 45% of funding from a 2 cent per pack cigarette surtax generates approximately \$9 million per year for CBCRP
- Since 1997 CBCRP has awarded more than \$18 million to 70 collaborative projects conducted by 61 different California institutions through the CRC Awards

3

CBCRP Priorities

1. The Community Impact of Breast Cancer: The Social Context
2. Etiology and Prevention: Finding the Underlying Causes
3. Biology of the Breast Cell: The Basic Science of the Disease
4. Detection, Prognosis, and Treatment: Delivering Clinical Solutions

<http://www.cbcrp.org/research/>

4

...the CRC Awards

- Pilot Award
 - 18 months
 - \$150,000 plus indirect costs
- Full Award
 - 3 years
 - \$600,000 plus indirect costs
- \$2 million annual set-aside for CRC Awards
- Historically high funding rates, 15-50% of applications funded



5

CRC Awards Timeline



- **February 24, 2011, Application due**
NOON pacific time
 - *March 3, 2011, Email face page with signatures*
5pm pacific time
 - *April – May, 2011 Peer Review of Applications*
 - *June 2011 Advisory Council Programmatic Review*
 - *June 2011 Funding announced*
 - *August 2011 Awards begin*

6

CRC Awards Timeline



- **February 24, 2011, Application due**
NOON pacific time
 - **March 3, 2011, Email face page with signatures**
5pm pacific time
- **April – May, 2011 Peer Review of Applications**
 - **June 2011 Advisory Council Programmatic Review**
 - **June 2011 Funding announced**
- **August 2011 Awards begin**

13

Application Structure

- **Templates and Data Fields.**
 - Pre-formatted Web pages on the proposalCENTRAL website
- **Downloadable Forms.**
 - Individual forms that you download to your computer, complete, and then upload back to your application in PDF format.
 - They are available to download on the proposalCENTRAL website in Proposal Sections #2 and #10.

14

Templates and Data Fields

1. Title Page
2. Download Templates & Instructions
3. Enable Other Users to Access this Proposal
4. Applicant
5. Applicant Institution & Contacts
6. Collaborating Investigator(s) & Contacts
7. Abstracts
8. Combined Project Budget Summary
9. Organization Assurances
10. Research Plan & Other Attachments
11. Validate
12. Print Face Page(s) When Application Complete
13. Submit

15

Downloadable Forms

- Lay abstract
- Scientific abstract
- Program responsiveness
- Additional criteria
- Collaborative agreements
- Distinction from other funding
- Budget – each institution (upload [excel](#) & [pdf](#))
- Budget justification and facilities
- Financial status questionnaire
- Key personnel
- Biographical sketch and other support
- Previous submission review response
- Research plan
- Human subjects
- Vertebrate animals
- Appendix cover sheet

16

General Grantsmanship Points

- Read the instructions and tell us exactly what we ask for
- “Write for” the review criteria
- CRC = *real* science & *real* community
- Spell check & grammatical editing
- Format correctly: double-space & 1/2 inch margins

17

2-step Review Process

- Peer Review by non-CA review committee
 - Comments & Scored, Discussed, Final Scoring & Comments*
- Programmatic Review by CA-based Advisory Council Subcommittee
 - Proposals discussed & scored

*Reviewers comments & scores will be sent to all co-PIs

18

2-step Review Process

- Peer Review by non-CA review committee
 - Comments & Scored, Discussed, Final Scoring & Comments*

19

Peer Review Structure

- Each application reviewed by non-CA based:
 - 2-3 scientists from relevant disciplines, including scientists who are experts in CBPR
 - breast cancer or other community representatives
- Applications are:
 - Scored (1-10 points) on 4 equally weighted Evaluation Criteria:
 - Quality of the Research
 - Feasibility
 - Partnership
 - Community Benefit
 - All scores from all four criteria, from all reviewers, combined, averaged, and ranked

20

CRC Peer Review Criteria

All applications are scored individually on a 1-10 point scale for each of the following four criteria:

21

CRC Peer Review Criteria

- The extent to which the project can be successful given the partners knowledge, skills, resources, and experience
- The likelihood of completing the project as proposed given the available funding and time frame
- For Full awards: The usefulness (validity and/or importance) of data from previous research for the proposed research plan

22

CRC Peer Review Criteria

- The scientific importance of the research questions, including consideration of the most relevant literature and whether results with the population being researched will apply to other populations
- The appropriateness and integration of the conceptual framework, research methods, and data analysis plan to the research question and aims
- The strength of the research plan to answer the research questions.

23

CRC Peer Review Criteria

- Plans for the equality of control and participation by both partners in all phases of the research project
- The level to which both partners' knowledge is integrated into planning the research
- The extent to which agreements have been reached regarding procedures for resolving disagreements among collaborators, ownership of data, and dissemination of the results
- The potential for capacity building for any or all of the partners.
- For Full awards: Demonstrated successful collaboration in previous research projects

24

CRC Peer Review Criteria

- The clarity of definition of the target community for the research
- How the community has been involved in the development of the research idea and the writing of the application
- Plans for how the broader lay community will be involved in the research project during the course of the research, from helping to conceptualize the research question through dissemination of results
- The potential importance and benefit to the broader lay community of the research question and expected outcomes
- The potential for the research project to facilitate learning and further collaboration.
- *For Full awards:* The plan for translating the results into tangible benefits for the community and for informing the community of the results of the research.



Community Benefit

25

2-step Review Process

- Programmatic Review by CA-based Advisory Council Subcommittee
 - Proposals discussed & scored

26

Programmatic Review Structure

- Advisory Council (CA-based) subcommittees
 - Includes advocates, clinicians, and scientists
- Review only applications with sufficient scientific and collaborative scores
- Review only limited forms of your application
 - Will NOT see your Research Plan or Collaboration Plan.

27

Programmatic Review Criteria

- Response to priorities
- Response to award type
- Dissemination and translation potential
- Underfunded
- Quality of the lay abstract
- Addressing the needs of the underserved
- Advocacy-sensitivity and inclusion

28

Downloadable Forms Reviewed in Programmatic Review

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| • Lay abstract* | • Financial status questionnaire |
| • Scientific abstract* | • Key personnel |
| • Program responsiveness* | • Biographical sketch and other support* |
| • Additional criteria* | • Previous submission review response |
| • Collaborative agreements | • Research plan |
| • Distinction from other funding* | • Human subjects |
| • Budget – each institution | • Vertebrate animals |
| • Budget justification and facilities | • Appendix cover sheet |

29

Funding Decision

- Based on:
 - The average and individual components of the scientific and collaboration ratings from the peer review
 - The programmatic rating from the advisory council review
 - Available funding

30

Award Process

- Cycle 17 funding starts August 1, 2011
- Awards are contingent on
 - IRB approval
 - Any changes recommended by review
 - Other administrative issues (overhead issues, possible grant duplication)
- Funds disbursed annually
- Annual Progress Reports and Final Report
- 20% funding of last year of grant disbursed after all reports received accepted (non-UC budgets)

31

Seven Steps To Begin

1. Designate one co-PI as the Applicant/PI and log onto proposalCENTRAL first
2. Log-in (First Time Users Register first)
3. Go to Grant Opportunities tab and sort CBCRP
4. Select CRC Pilot or Full Award
5. Fill in Title Page/Save
6. Enable Other Users
7. Download Instructions and Downloadable Forms

32

Altum proposalCENTRAL
<https://proposalcentral.altum.com/>

33

Assistance Is Available

Senaida Fernandez, Ph.D.
Manager, Community Research Initiatives
California Breast Cancer Research Program
University of California Office of the President
300 Lakeside Drive, 6th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612-3550
Phone (510) 987-0491
Fax (510) 587-6325
Email Senaida.Fernandez@ucop.edu

34

Thank you!



Questions?