

GUIDE FOR ASSIGNED REVIEWERS' PRELIMINARY COMMENTS ON MORE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AWARD (K01) APPLICATIONS

NIGMS PAR-95-048

Complete details at: <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PAR-95-048.html>

The purpose of the Minority Opportunities for Research (MORE) Faculty Development Award Program is to enhance the research and research training capabilities of the home institution by offering faculty the opportunity to update or retool their research skills through high quality research experiences. Successful candidates will also have the opportunity to enroll in one course per academic term in fields directly related to the research in order to update his/her theoretical background. The expectation is that these new skills will enhance the research and teaching environment of the home institution. Ideally, the experience would lead to long-term collaborations between the candidate and the faculty of the research institution.

General Considerations when reviewing MORE Faculty Development Award Applications:

1. Candidates
 - Must be full-time, permanent faculty in a biomedically-related science, including behavioral science, or mathematics at the home institution for at least 3 years at the time of submission of the application
 - Received the Ph.D. or equivalent at least 5 years before the date of the application
 - Intend to remain at the home institution at the end of the training period
 - Demonstrate a commitment to research and teaching in a minority institution
 - Plan to conduct research in a science (including mathematics) related to biomedical or behavioral research
 - Be a citizen or a non-citizen national of the U.S., or have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the U.S. at the time of application
2. Home Institution (Where the candidate is employed)
 - Must be a domestic private or public minority institution, that is, one with a significant enrollment of underrepresented minorities
 - Offers at least the baccalaureate degree in the biomedical or behavioral sciences or mathematic
 - Demonstrates support of the candidate's plans
 - Guarantees and provides appropriate release time each year for the candidate for full-time research and to take courses at the research institution
3. Research Institution (University/Institution where the candidate conducts his/her full-time summer or academic term research and takes courses)
 - May be 1) public or private; 2) domestic or foreign
 - Must offer a solid research environment as evidenced by a high-level of faculty involvement in biomedical research and a high-level of research support through competitive grants, such as Howard Hughes Medical Institute support, or similar quality-based support
 - May NOT be the candidate's home institution
4. Sponsor
 - Directs the candidate's research
 - Must be a faculty member (or equivalent) at the research institution
 - Should have a distinguished record of achievement in research documented by high quality research publications and/or competitive research grant support.

CRITIQUE

Each major review element within the MORE Faculty Development Award application (Candidate, Research/Coursework Plan, and Training Environment and Sponsor) should be commented on in a separate section of your written critique. For revised applications, also comment briefly on whether the application is improved, the same, or worse. In addition, provide a one-sentence summary of your evaluation at the end of each section. After considering all of the review criteria, briefly summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the application and recommend an overall level of merit in a section titled Summary and Recommendations (see below). Please note that your comments will be used essentially unedited in the final summary statement sent to the candidate.

The following review criteria should be considered when writing your critique:

Candidate

- Research and teaching experience
- Professional honors and awards
- Scientific publications and/or presentations
- References
- Training and career goals
- Plans for using research experiences to enhance the research and teaching capability of the home institution.
- Possession of research funding is not considered a necessary criterion

Research/Coursework Plan

- Quality and appropriateness of the proposed research
- Associated course work (if applicable)

Training Environment and Sponsor

- Quality of the research environment at the research institution, including, but not limited to, the qualifications and grant support of the sponsor

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

In one paragraph, briefly summarize the most important points of the Critique, addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the application in terms of the three review criteria. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to receive a good rating. Each scored application will receive a numerical rating that will reflect your opinion of its merit. The numerical rating is based on a scale from 1.0 for the most meritorious to 5.0 for the least meritorious with increments of 0.1 unit. Reviewers should score the "average" application they customarily review in their Scientific Review Group with a score of 3.0. This practice is designed to have 3.0 be the median.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Foreign Training: In a separate section, describe the scientific advantages of the proposed training in a foreign country and compare it to relevant training opportunities available in this country. Comment on any special talents, resources, populations, or environmental conditions that are not readily available in the United States or that augment existing resources. This consideration should not be factored into your overall recommendation and rating.

Protection Of Human Subjects From Research Risks: Evaluate the application with reference to the following criteria: risk to subjects, adequacy of protection against risks, potential benefit to the subjects and to others, importance of the knowledge to be gained. (If the applicant fails to address **all** of these elements, notify the SRA immediately to determine if the application should be withdrawn.) If all of the criteria are adequately addressed, and there are no concerns. Write "Acceptable Risks and/or Adequate Protections." A brief explanation is advisable. If one or more criteria are inadequately addressed, write, "Unacceptable Risks and/or Inadequate Protections" and document the actual or potential issues that create the human subjects concern. If the application indicates that the proposed human subjects research is exempt from coverage by the regulations, determine if adequate justification is provided. If the claimed exemption is not justified, indicate "Unacceptable" and explain why you reached this conclusion. Also, if a clinical trial is proposed, evaluate the Data and Safety Monitoring Plan. (If the plan is absent, notify the SRA immediately to determine if the application should be withdrawn.) Indicate if the plan is "Acceptable" or "Unacceptable", and, if unacceptable, explain why it is unacceptable.

Gender, Minority And Children Subjects: Public Law 103-43 requires that women and minorities must be included in all NIH-supported clinical research projects involving human subjects unless a clear and compelling rationale establishes that inclusion is inappropriate with respect to the health of the subjects or the purpose of the research. NIH requires that children (individuals under the age of 21) of all ages be involved in all human subjects research supported by the NIH unless there are scientific or ethical reasons for excluding them. Each project involving human subjects must be assigned a code using the categories "1" to "5" below. Category 5 for minority representation in the project means that only foreign subjects are in the study population (no U.S. subjects). If the study uses both then use codes 1 thru 4. Examine whether the minority and gender characteristics of the sample are scientifically acceptable, consistent with the aims of the project, and comply with NIH policy. For each category, determine if the proposed subject recruitment targets are "A" (acceptable) or "U" (unacceptable). If you rate the sample as "U", consider this feature a weakness in the research design and reflect it in the overall score. Explain the reasons for the recommended codes; this is particularly critical for any item coded "U".

Category	Gender (G)	Minority (M)	Children (C)
1	Both Genders	Minority & non-minority	Children & adults
2	Only Women	Only minority	Only children
3	Only Men	Only non-minority	No children included
4	Gender Unknown	Minority representation unknown	Representation of children unknown
5		Only Foreign Subjects	

NOTE: To the degree that acceptability or unacceptability affects the investigator's approach to the proposed research, such comments should appear under the "Research Plan" section of the criteria, and should be factored into the score as appropriate.

Animal Welfare: Express any comments or concerns about the appropriateness of the responses to the five required points, especially whether the procedures will be limited to those that are unavoidable in the conduct of scientifically sound research.

Biohazards: Note any materials or procedures that are potentially hazardous to research personnel and indicate whether the protection proposed will be adequate.

Further information about NIH research training and career development opportunities can be found at <http://grants.nih.gov/training>