MICHR Pathway to First Grant 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 organization involved.

AWARD INFORMATION:

Duration: One year

Budget: For applicants from U-M Ann Arbor, MICHR will provide a maximum of $25,000. A minimum 1:1 match is required and may be secured from a single source or multiple sources, including your academic unit. If you are applying from a unit of the Endowment for Basic Sciences, see page 5. Applicants from U-M Flint and U-M Dearborn using a CBPR approach may write grants with budgets up to $30,000 that will be fully funded by MICHR (matching is not required).

Eligibility: All active University of Michigan faculty who have not served as Principal Investigator on an extramural grant are eligible to apply as Principal Investigator (PI). All community partners who are affiliated with a non-academic 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. Partners who do not have an organizational affiliation may serve as collaborators, consultants, mentors, and other prominent roles in conducting the project.

Restrictions: You are limited to one grant submission per round. No more than two separate MICHR pilot grants (>25K) can be held by one Principal 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 IIB, 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.

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 MICHR notifies you of your fundable score, you will have six months to obtain IRB/IACUC approval (protocols must be submitted within four months). If approval is not obtained within this timeframe, MICHR reserves the right to deny funding.
Contact: For questions about this funding opportunity, contact MICHR-PilotGrants@umich.edu. For assistance developing your project, contact the Research Development Core. For consultation related to community engagement, contact MICHR-CommunityEngagement@umich.edu.

APPLICATION DEADLINE: Monday, April 13, 2020 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 template 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 (resubmissions only; 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 research questions, the expected outcomes, the expected impact on the field and community involved, and the potential for improving patient and/or community health.

   *Combined 5-page limit for sections B-I*

   B. Background and Significance* (~0.5 pages, modeled after NIH criteria):

      • Describe the importance of the specific health issue 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 interventions 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* (~0.25 pages, modeled after 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, 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** (~2.75 pages, modeled after NIH criteria):
   - Provide an overview of the study 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 alternative approaches that will be used if unexpected results are found.

F. **Impact** (~0.25 pages):
   - Describe the immediate impact of the proposed research.
   - Explain how the research will impact patient care and/or the community in the future.

G. **Timeline and Milestones of Success** (~0.25 pages):
   - Describe when key research activities will be accomplished, and milestones of progress assessed, during the award year. Use a table format as needed.
   - Include plans for disseminating the findings to communities involved.

H. **Career Plan** (or **Research Successes** or **New Research Direction**) (~ 0.25 pages):
   - Early Career Investigators (see designations on page 5): Describe the mentoring plan, which must include at least one clinical, translational or community-engaged faculty. Include information about the mentor(s) and the purpose and goals of the mentoring relationship specific to both your research and career development. As applicable, describe training activities (e.g., didactic, professional, etc.) that support your scientific development.
   - Established Investigators (see designations on page 5): Describe your research successes and challenges to date.
   - Faculty seeking their first extramural grant in a new area of research: Explain how the proposed research is a significant departure from previous efforts. If you are also an Early Career Investigator, address the career plan requirements.

I. **Future Funding and Research Program** (~ 0.25 pages):
   - Identify the extramural grant (e.g., K, R21, specific foundation, etc) you intend to apply for in the future and explain how this funding, and completion of the proposed project, will help you to submit a competitive extramural application.
   - Describe the vision for your future research program, including long-term goals, and how your experience to date and MICHR funding will support your success.

**Additional Proposal Narrative Components (not included in 5-page limit for B-I):**

J. **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.

K. Human Subjects (if applicable; no page limit):

- Follow the NIH guidelines for completing the following sections.
  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.

L. References (no page limit)

3. Budget and Justification: Complete using form provided in Competition Space.

- Budget and justification must reflect the total budget (MICHR and matching).
- Budget must allocate at least 50% of the requested funds to the community investigator(s) and non-academic organization partner(s) involved in the project.
- The Academic Principal Investigator must devote a minimum of 5% effort to the project (charged to the pilot grant or concurrent with their U-M faculty position).
- 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.
- Individuals who commit to contribute to the scientific development or execution of the project, but do not commit any specified measurable effort (i.e., person months) to the project, should be designated as Other Significant Contributor.
- If mentors charge effort to the pilot grant, their roles beyond mentoring need to be well justified.
- Unallowable budget items: Subcontracts with associated facilities & administrative costs, administrative/clerical staff expenses, postage, telephones, memberships, hosting, equipment, cost overruns, retroactive funding, grant preparation costs, graduate student stipends and tuition costs, salary support for Fellows already funded by the 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. Partners who are not affiliated with U-M or do not have a research background 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. **Letters must be submitted for any effort that is not charged to the pilot grant budget.**

6. **Signature Page**: Use form in Competition Space. Sign-off by the academic unit 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. Designating a Co-Investigator at zero person months effort should not be used to circumvent academic unit sign-off. Individuals who commit to contribute to the scientific development or execution of the project, but do not commit any specified measurable effort (i.e., person months) to the project, should be designated as Other Significant Contributor.
   - All matching/cost-share sources (e.g. multiple departments). 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 page limits.

**Endowment for Basic Sciences:**
The [Endowment for Basic Sciences](#) 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](#).

**MICHR Pilot Grant Program Definitions of Early Career and Established Investigators:**

**Early Career Investigator**: Assistant Professor, Lecturer, Instructor, Clinical Instructor, Research Investigator, Clinical Assistant Professor, Research Assistant Professor, or Assistant Research Scientist.

**Established Investigator**: Associate Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Research Associate Professor, Associate Research Scientist, Professor, Clinical Professor, Research Professor, or Research Scientist.

**APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION:**

The MICHR Pilot Grant Program requires applicants adhere to eligibility requirements and guidelines to promote a process whereby submitted grants are evaluated using a process that is fair, equitable, timely, and free of bias. The core values of peer review drive MICHR to seek the highest level of ethical standards. The Scientific Review Committee scores applications using the [NIH 1-9 point scale](#), and a patient advisor or community member will be included in the review process. These 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 Principal Investigators, Co-Investigators, Collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If seeking their first extramural grant, does the academic Principal Investigator have the appropriate experience and training, and is a career plan with an experienced mentor outlined? If seeking their first extramural grant in a new area of research, is the proposed work fully justified as a departure from the academic Principal Investigators’ prior research? Is the 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 one field 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 studies not directly involving humans, have they clearly described how the results will be translated into human studies as a next step?

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 the community and academic partners clear, fair and appropriate?

6. **Funding Goals:** If the study goals are attained, will the investigator be positioned to submit a competitive extramural grant?

7. **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.