

PolicyLab Community Partnerships in Research Program **Joint Pilot Award**

The Joint Pilot Project Award is part of PolicyLab's Community Partnerships in Research Program. It is geared towards established community-academic partnerships who seek funds for a well-defined research project that may produce preliminary data for future competitive grant applications. Joint Pilot Project Awards are supported for up to a maximum of \$40,000 for up to two years.

How can funds be used?

Joint Pilot Project Awards activities may include, but are not limited to:

- Pilot translational research involving T3 and T4 research. ([Translational Research Classifications](#))
- Data collection and/or analysis of community-specific information, program implementation, or evaluation involving quantitative and/or qualitative data collection methodologies.
- Studies of community translation processes, including studies of dissemination methods.

Eligibility

- All applications must be co-led by a Community Lead and a CHOP Academic Lead. Please see the definitions for Academic Lead and Community Lead in the Request for Application.

Other Criteria

- Projects that do not involve community engagement within the affected community and/or patient population throughout the research project will not be considered.
- Funding is not designed to support delivery of ongoing program services or to purchase equipment or capital expenses.
- An Academic Lead and Community Lead can only apply for one grant per award cycle.
- Budgets must include funding directed to the organization represented by the Community Lead.
- Projects which constitute Human Subjects Research are subject to [Institutional Review Board \(IRB\) policy](#), and IRB submission is expected within 30 days of award notification.
- A minimum of 50% of funds must be expended within year one of the grant period for 18- or 24-month grants. Requests for no-cost extensions will not be considered beyond 24 months. For single-year grants, requests for no-cost extensions will be considered for up to a maximum of 20% at the discretion of PolicyLab's Leadership Team in consultation with our business manager.

Review Process

A Review Committee composed of academic and community reviewers with experience in community-engaged research will review all grant applications, giving preference to those that have the potential to meaningfully engage community partners in the research process, improve research translation and decrease health inequities. Applications should be well written, precise, and succinct, and should follow the provided template.

Selection Criteria

The review criteria, adapted from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) scoring system, will be used to score proposals as follows:

- *Community Impact*: Does the application involve direct community participation in all stages of research? Is the proposed benefit to the community clear? How will knowledge of an issue, care delivery, policies, and/or programs be improved and translated? Is there potential for community sustainability after the program ends?
- *Equity*: Does the plan describe involvement of traditionally underrepresented stakeholder groups, especially those from underserved, marginalized and/or hard-to-reach communities? Is the proposed impact on health equity clear?
- *Significance of Study*: Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? Does it address a research topic identified by and/or of importance to community partners?
- *Approach*: Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies and benchmarks for success presented? Are resources allocated equitably?
- *Appropriateness of Budget*: Is the proposed budget and period of support appropriate in relation to the research?
- *Likelihood of Future Research*: If the aims are achieved, will the results lend themselves to future research?
- *Overall Impact*: Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the candidate to maintain a strong research partnership with the community, in consideration of the previous six scored review criteria. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to have a major impact.

Impact	Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance on Strengths and Weaknesses
High	1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
	2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
	3	Excellent	Very Strong with only some minor weaknesses
Medium	4	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
	5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
	6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but with at least some moderate weaknesses
Low	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

Key Dates

- Request for Applications: 8/22/2022 – 10/17/2022
- Technical Assistance Office Hours: 9/14, 12-1 p.m.; 9/22, 1-2 p.m.
- *Submission Deadline: 10/17/2022 at 5 p.m.*
- Notification of Award: 12/1/2022
- Anticipated Start Date: 1/1/2023

How to Apply for the Joint Pilot Project Award

Please submit your application as a single Word document via email to Meredith Matone at matonem@chop.edu by **October 17 at 5 p.m.** Please use the included template. Application components include:

- Cover page, listing: Project Title, Academic Lead and their Department/Division, Community Lead and their organizational affiliation
- Project Description, including: Background and Rationale, Specific Aims, Research Strategy (Significance, Innovation and Approach, including Partnership Activities)
- Description of application of community-engaged research principles. Please reflect on the following (as appropriate): decision-making, compensation, attribution, participation and translation.
- Memorandum of Understanding (see provided template)
- Budget and justification
- CV or NIH bio sketch for Academic Lead (see example template)
- Bio or resume for Community Lead

Budget

Budgets must be reviewed and approved by your business manager prior to submission. Funding may not be used for Academic Lead salary support. Community Lead and staff salaries are allowable budget items. Provide a breakdown of costs by category (e.g., personnel, travel, supplies, etc.), and describe in the Budget Justification how the funds will be used and how the costs were calculated. Although projects may be funded up to the maximum amount, priority will be given to projects that include a prudent spending plan. PolicyLab will attempt to fund all requested budgets in full but may elect to partially fund certain protocols to increase the number of funded proposals.

Award Requirements

- Successful applicants must show documentation of IRB submission within 30 days of award notification.
- Academic and Community Leads must submit a year-end report for review by the PolicyLab pilot program grant committee. This report should include key milestones and accomplishments, future partnership plans, expenditures and lessons learned. Any products or deliverables (reports, presentations, etc.) should also be reported.
- Subsequent annual report(s) will be requested to include publications, other products and extramural funding resulting from the research.
- Award recipients must present at the conclusion of the project at a PolicyLab Morning Speaker Series. Mid-project or works-in-progress presentations are available through the PolicyLab Hub series (or other venues TBD with support of the PolicyLab Scientific Director).

For questions or support:

- Program staff will offer assistance to help applicants prepare strong, competitive applications that meet the program goals. Two technical assistance office hours will be held on 9/14 from 12-1 p.m. and 9/22 from 1-2 p.m. Please contact Meredith Matone (matonem@chop.edu) to schedule.

PolicyLab Community Partnership in Research Program Joint Pilot Award

Application Template

Project Title:

Academic Lead:

Department/Division:

Email:

Community Lead:


Organizational Affiliation:


Email:

Date Submitted:

Project Description

Background & Rationale, Specific Aims, Research Strategy (Significance, Innovation and Approach) and Partnership Activities **(3 pages)**





Description of application of community-engaged research principles

Please reflect on the following (as appropriate): decision-making, compensation, attribution, participation and translation. **(1-2 pages)**



Budget and Justification (1 page)

Memorandum of Understanding Template

PolicyLab Community Partnerships in Research Program

Applicants for the Joint Pilot Project Award, as part of PolicyLab's Community Partnerships in Research Program, are required to submit a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). This MOU should define the purpose and structure of the research partnership and cover four key themes: statement of research partnership purpose, mutual interests, shared decision making and data ownership. The following template has been provided, adopted from "[Memorandum of Understanding for Mutually Beneficial Research](#)," by Eric Gordon and Liat Racin.

Statement of Purpose & Mutual Interest

(All partners should be clear about the purpose of the research and have a clear understanding of the terms of the partnership).

This MOU is a voluntary agreement between the Community Lead, _____, and the Academic Lead, _____, as part of their involvement in the Joint Pilot Project Award, funded by PolicyLab at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.

The purpose of this joint pilot project is to:

In this research project, the 'community' is understood to be:

Through this partnership, the Academic Lead wishes to achieve:

Through this partnership, the Community Lead wishes to achieve:

We share a common interest in addressing the high priority issue(s) of _____ in the community.

The partnership will last _____ year(s) and require about _____ hours per week from the Academic Lead and _____ hours per week from the Community Lead.

Shared Decision-making

(Decision-making affects the dynamics of the partnership and the project. Mutually agreed upon decision-making is a constant undertaking. Partners should recognize each other's expertise and skills to collaborative work towards achieving the project goals and benefiting the community).

Throughout all stages of the research partnership, the Academic Lead and Community Lead commit to practicing shared decision making and collaboration. This will be achieved by:

Differences in culture, perspectives, and language may affect approaches to communicating, sharing information, and making decisions. Academic Leads will be aware of and respect culturally sensitive issues and the rights of the community. The following steps are in place to ensure conflicts are addressed and resolved:

Data Ownership

(Ownership of, and access to, data is shared by both the Academic and Community Leads. A plan should be in place for use and storage of data.)

The following new data will be collected for this project:

(If applicable) The following existing data will be reused for this project:

(If applicable) The following technical or financial supports will be provided to assist the Community Lead and their organization in equally participating in data collection, generation, and analysis:

Data review, analysis, and interpretation will be conducted by:

Data will be managed and protected by:

Data will be physically located at:

Data will be stored for the following amount of time:

After the proposed amount of time for storage, data will be archived or disposed of by:

The Community Lead can access all data through the following pathways:

The Academic and Community Lead will interpret and share findings with the community in an accessible and practical way that is geared towards education, advocacy, or social change. The format of information sharing will include:

All products resulting from the project will acknowledge the contribution and knowledge of the community and Community Lead. The Community Lead and Academic Lead will collaborate on all submission of materials for publication, including research findings, written content, and design. The following steps will be taken to ensure mutual contribution to, and agreement on, publication materials:

Agreement

(If partnerships are no longer mutually beneficial, and changes to the impact community participation occur, either party may end the collaboration).

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into on _____ (date).

Academic Lead:

_____ (print name)

_____ (signature)

Community Lead:

_____ (print name)

_____ (signature)

NIH Biographical Sketch Template

OMB No. 0925-0001 and 0925-0002 (Rev. 10/2021 Approved Through 09/30/2024)

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Provide the following information for the Senior/key personnel and other significant contributors. Follow this format for each person.
DO NOT EXCEED FIVE PAGES.

NAME:

eRA COMMONS USER NAME (credential, e.g., agency login):

POSITION TITLE:

EDUCATION/TRAINING (*Begin with baccalaureate or other initial professional education, such as nursing, include postdoctoral training and residency training if applicable. Add/delete rows as necessary.*)

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION	DEGREE (if applicable)	Completion Date MM/YYYY	FIELD OF STUDY

A. Personal Statement

Briefly describe why you are well-suited for your role(s) in this project. Relevant factors may include: aspects of your training; your previous experimental work on this specific topic or related topics; your technical expertise; your collaborators or scientific environment; and/or your past performance in this or related fields, including ongoing and completed research projects from the past three years that you want to draw attention to (previously captured under Section D. Research Support).

You may cite up to four publications or research products that highlight your experience and qualifications for this project. Research products can include, but are not limited to, audio or video products; conference proceedings such as meeting abstracts, posters, or other presentations; patents; data and research materials; databases; educational aids or curricula; instruments or equipment; models; protocols; and software or netware. Use of hyperlinks and URLs to cite these items is not allowed.

B. Positions, Scientific Appointments, and Honors

List in reverse chronological order all current positions and scientific appointments both domestic and foreign, including affiliations with foreign entities or governments. This includes titled academic, professional, or institutional appointments whether or not remuneration is received, and whether full-time, part-time, or voluntary (including adjunct, visiting, or honorary).

C. Contributions to Science

Briefly describe up to five of your most significant contributions to science. The description of each contribution should be no longer than one half page, including citations. For each contribution, you may cite up to four publications or research products that are relevant to the contribution. If you are not the author of the product, indicate what your role or contribution was. Note that while you may mention manuscripts that have not yet been accepted for publication as part of your contribution, you may cite only published papers to support each contribution. Research products can include audio or video products (see the NIH Grants Policy Statement, Section 2.3.7.7: Post-Submission Grant Application Materials); conference proceedings such as meeting abstracts, posters, or other presentations; patents; data and research materials; databases; educational aids or curricula; instruments or equipment; models; protocols; and software or netware. Use of hyperlinks and URLs to cite these items is not allowed.