

VMED Webinar Full-text Transcript

“Grants 101: Receipt, Referral, Review”

Presented by Dr. Marina Broitman

National Institute of Mental Health

July 18, 2012

Yeates Conwell: Welcome Marina, it's wonderful to have you join us we are in the middle of a series of webinars and I think you know from talking with Lauren Hill who is our program officer and/or Jane Pearson who is our scientific liaison for this U24 grant with NIMH what we're about here. We've got a person who is not able to be here with us today besides Jane who is away, that's Joe Perpich who is the Co-PI with me. Let me introduce Dr. Marina Broitman to you all. Dr. Broitman is a scientific review officer within the extramural review branch at NIMH where she oversees the review of grant applications in the areas that include mental health services, child mental health interventions and global mental health; she also is an associate referral liaison for NIMH. She has a background in behavioral sciences having gotten her PhD at George Washington University in clinical psychology program with a focus on pediatric psychology and ADHD. Dr. Broitman is going to talk to us today some of the fundamentals of how grants are managed. Now I wonder Marina as you begin could you tell the group who really are in some cases very fresh to the whole system of grant submission and review about what the extramural branch is just very briefly and what a scientific review officer does or maybe that's embedded in your talk but just so we get off on the right foot, welcome, thank you.

Marina Broitman: Thank you Yeates. I will talk a little bit about what a scientific review officer does specifically but I'll be happy to talk about a little bit about how the extramural review branch fits into the NIMH structure. I'm sure Lauren has gone over with you each institute or center there are a number of divisions some of which house the intermural scientific research which typically goes on, on the NIMH campus or at other NIMH facilities. The extramural side which is the money that you all do apply and will be applying for is separate from that and it's divided basically two different scientific groups. One group involves the program officers like Jane and Lauren who give the technical assistance and help manage the grants once they're in and gives advice to people who are applying for grants and there are the

review officers who deal with the peer review process to evaluate the scientific and technical merit of those grants. The reason why those are separate is to be able to maintain a firewall between programs and reviews so that it's very clear that the review process is without conflicts of interest and provides the best possible review of the grant applications. So that's a big part of my job and what I'll talk about today. What I'm going to do is sort of go through the life of a grant from the time you start preparing it to the time things get decided about whether or not it will get funded and I'm going to go through my slides I'm going to try and do these at a reasonable pace and allow time for questions at the end that way I can make sure to get through all the information that I want to give you but please do track questions and send them in and I'll be able to go through those a little bit more and maybe we can have a little more of a conversation. So I'll go through the application submission process, the receipt and referral process for grant applications, what happens in review and some tips and suggestions that I've identified based on the review meetings that I've attended and what I've heard reviewers saying that...telling me about the grant application that they review and of course the grant process starts with an investigated initiated ideas, typically which is your great ideas about science that needs to be done to solve some of our big public health questions.

The grant process occurs, there are three basically overlapping cycles during the course of the year and these cycles are tied to the advisory council round, each institute in the center has an advisory council made up of some of the leading scientists in that area to make final decisions and recommendations of applications that have been reviewed through the peer review process. Those council meetings happen three times a year as you can see in the fall and the winter and then again in the spring and tied to those are submission dates, these are the submission dates that you typically see where an application is submitted in February tends to get reviewed around June for a September or October council date and then a couple months after that should an application be approved for funding for the award, the actual check to be written so there are some delays in this process and I realize it seems just like an endless process but hopefully from what I tell you today it will help you understand that process a little bit better and why it takes so long. The first part going through the application process will be preparation of the application and then there are a few things to consider, there is the science to consider and how you present that and what are your goals for the science, there's finding the correct funding opportunity for

your scientific idea and putting it in the context and there's making sure you completed all the administrative steps necessary to submit the application. So you want to be discussing your ideas for the science with other investigators, other investigators, mentors of yours within your institution who have been grant funded and also people you meet from consultants to investigators to bring their expertise in the areas where you may not have as much expertise for your application. You want to be able to get help from your institutional official very early on from your grant offices to make sure that your registration for the eRA Commons is complete to make sure they are aware of the funded opportunity that you are interested in, to make sure that you're meeting their time lines for getting the application in on time. Because NIH does not accept applications late even if you tried to submit it by the deadline but it ended up coming in a few hours after the deadline it may not get submitted and you have wait for the next deadline to be able to submit that application in and you want to make sure that you're getting that you contact the appropriate program officer for the type of science you're interested in and if you're not sure about that then I encourage you to review the websites so that the institutions that you may be interested in and identify potential programs officers, contact them and they'll steer you into a different direction if there is somebody else who you should be talking to.

The best way to contact them is usually by e-mail, sending them a page or two of your idea so that they can really evaluate whether or not it's within their program area or if there is somebody else you should be talking with. I'm sure Lauren spoke with you about this as well but if you are within ten years of your terminal degree or completion of training then you can be considered an early stage investigator. There's a way that eRA Commons for you to indicate when your training is completed and that date will be used to identify you as an early stage investigator. The purpose of being an ESI is that you are treated a little bit differently by the institute because of the focus of getting people into independent sites of the tracks earlier and getting them to able to write successful grants and complete research early in their careers.

Now the definition of an ESI or a new investigator only applies on the R01 mechanism, that's what they're tracking and the R01 is the bread and butter mechanism for grant applications at NIH so you may find that you submitted a small grant, an R03 or an R21 or a treatment development, R34 but to NIH and that new investigator status does not appear for that grant

application and the reason is that those things are only being tracked for the R01. That doesn't mean that you can't mention it and highlight it in your application itself it can let you keep the reviewers keep that in mind when they're evaluating you as an investigator. Now almost all of the grant applications that are submitted to the NIH and pretty much anything that you might apply for is done through electronic submission. This has made it much easier for many people to submit grant applications but it also means an extra level of technology that you need to get through and technology that you may have trouble with. The process of electronic submission goes to grants.gov which is a government contracting agency and it's a separate registration process from the eRA Commons registration process. Now your institutional grants office should be very familiar with the grants.gov website and that registration but you want to make sure you talk with them very early about that process. This is also where it becomes very important for you to identify the funding opportunity announcement that you're going to be focused on because you'll be applying through that funding opportunity announcement and you want to make sure that it's correct because it may affect where your grant application ends up. For instance there are some funding opportunities that have specific review locuses or specific admission dates that are listed in that notice so you want to be able to check that to make sure that you're applying at the right time and it's going to go where you think it's going to go, this is something that you should definitely check with your program officer about, you should check with your institutional official about to make sure that you're doing it correctly, read through the funding opportunity very, very carefully before applying for that particular funding opportunity because that's when all of the information will pop up with all the forms for you to fill out when you apply through that mechanism and if you're going into the wrong funding opportunity it's going to be very hard to back track.

So to identify potential funding opportunities NIMH has the current funding opportunities listed on our website, you can also go to the NIH guide for grants and contracts where you'll be able to identify potential funding opportunities, you'll be able to search through them for topics. Now once you submit your application one of the things you'll...once it goes through the grants.gov process it goes from grants.gov, that submission, into the electronic review administration system, the eRA Commons and then you will finally get a grant identification number and it seems like a complicated bunch of numbers but they also have some kind of meaning and

sometimes you get it wrong so you want to make sure that the grant application will make sense. So in this slide it just shows the different parts to it. This one indicates that it's a new application, you may have a type 1 or a type 2 which is competing renewal, a type 3 which is a supplement for instance an administrative or diversity supplement, competing supplement to an existing award.

This is of course the actual mechanism, this is an R01, the R refers to a research grant if you're submitting a K23 for instance or a K01 that would be the key that's it's a career development grant and that's the number that will appear here. This acronym indicates which institute it was submitted to and this may not be where you meant for it to be submitted but where it ended up because the institute you wanted it to go to doesn't accept that kind of mechanism or because it was really more in line with the particular institutes guidelines. If you have a question about this again this is a very good time to contact officials to make sure that it's ended up in the appropriate place for the kind of science that you are submitting because it doesn't matter how well it does in the peer review that institute may not be interested in funding it because it's not really in their interest area. Then you have the actual serial number, this will be the identification number of the grant applications you'll need for that institute so each institute has a specific serial number, set of serial numbers and the one refers to the grant support year, if this is a new application it will typically be an 01 year, if it's for instance a diversity supplement to an existing grant award the number that's going to show up here is whatever number that current grant is so if it's in its third year then your diversity supplement will have an 03 here because that's the year of the grant and the A1 indicates a resubmission, remember that you do have the opportunity to revise and resubmit your application after peer review but only once so you really want to make sure that as good as application in the door the first time if possible and if it's not great the first time then you want to make sure to address all of the review comments for that second submission because you won't have another chance.

So how does an idea become a grant we'll go through the process a little bit and I'll go through the completion of the process but I'll try to take some time through some of pieces because it can be very complicated. So obviously you start off with your idea and once you have the pieces in place and the science then you want to submit the application, you find the appropriate funding

opportunity, you submit it into grants. Grants.gov takes a day or so to validate the application, this is very important you want to keep checking your e-mail, you should get an e-mail notification once the application has been accepted into grants.gov and once it has gone through its validation and so you should also get an e-mail if there are errors found in your application, something is missing, some page is not right the wrong pdf type of document, there are all of these sort of complicated, frustrating pieces of submitting the grant application but it needs to be worked out before it's a valid submission. The important thing to note here is that, that valid submission needs to happen before the deadline so for instance for the next round, the R01 deadline is June 5 at 5 p.m. your local time. That application needs to be into grants.gov complete and error free by 5 p.m. your local time, if you end up having errors in it where you need to fix the application before it can be accepted then it's going to be late if the final error free version is after 5:00. So you really want to give yourself a couple of days before the actual final finishing deadline or your application is just not going to be accepted for review or consideration.

Once the grants.gov has accepted the application then it goes into the eRA Common, at this point it will again be checked for validation did you exceed the page limits, were there any other problems or you're missing a section or should include a section and that should take a day or two as well, you'll be able to monitor that within your eRA Commons account as you see the application pull up in the eRA Commons account. Once the application pulls up you'll have a comments page for it, you'll have a bunch of information associated with that, that will include the grant number as I've showed you before, this complicated grant number, it will include contact information for a program officer and scientific review officer and it will include the name or the acronym for your scientific review group where it's been assigned. Now initially it's going to get assigned to a holding place for review, if it's assigned to the second scientific review for review it's going to get a holding place related to the integrate review group, the overarching review group for that area of science so it may not be assigned to a study section yet. If it's assigned for instance to the NIMH for review because we review our own applications that involve mental health interventions and services, it will be assigned to a holding place referred to as DMH1SRC99, again complicated code that has a little bit of meaning in it but it will not be the final home for that application it just hasn't been assigned to a study section. If you're

concerned about it please feel free to contact the person listed on your Commons page read the context for review and if no one's listed contact your program officer so they can help you work it out. If it's an NIMH application whether it's coming here or going to CSR feel free to contact me, my name is at the end of the slide but it's my job to make sure that your grant application ends up in the right place for review. So once it goes through the Commons again the Center for Scientific Review is the hub for all reviews at NIH, not all reviews happen there but if the division of receipt referral in the Center for Scientific Review that determines where an application is going to be sent for review and what the institutional home of that application is going to be, what institution is going to have primary responsibility of that application. Once CSR assigns the review group or the study section it goes to that study section which will then evaluate the application for scientific merit through the NIH review process then that evaluation along with a summary statement will be released to not only to you but also to your program official within the institute so they can make recommendations for funding. The program official will determine program relevance and provide the information back to the director of the institute and to the advisory council. The advisory council will then recommend action whether it's to fund, to not fund this round or other actions related to that application and the final action is determined by institute director. So you can see it may be a couple of months between the processes but there are a couple of steps that have to happen within the process and the number of eyes that have to look at it as you go along.

As I said the Center for Scientific Review is the central point for all the grant applications be submitted to NIH and to other DHHS agencies for instance AHRQ also has applications go to NIH and now a lot of the PCORI applications are coming through the NIH for review even if PCORI is actually not part of the federal government. So the Center for Scientific Review will do the administrative review, makes sure the application is complete and compliant with all the rules and validations, will make the assignments to the review groups and to the institute and center and Center for Scientific Review in addition holds review of about two-thirds of the applications coming into NIH every year through about 240 study sections across all possible disciplines. They maintain a very high work load and are also very oriented to the process of making sure that your grant review is the best that it can be. What does a scientific review group look like, so there are a number of steps a scientific review officer has to go through to get to be

into one of the groups? The scientific review officer remember is a scientist, typically within in the field of study of the reviews that they lead but not always, we have to be generalists and be able to identify expertise in a number of areas and there are a number of tools that we use to do that. When we get a set of applications for review the first thing we do is identify the expertise that is necessary to evaluate those applications, when we go through those applications and determine what type of expertise we need and then we identify potential reviewers through a number of searches through people we've worked with before and invite them to participate in the work we're reviewing, that usually takes place some weeks, four to six weeks after the reviewers have been identified to get them a chance to make travel plans that are necessary and to give them a chance to read through all the applications. Remember as your mentors can tell you the reviewers do their job outside of their regular work time often, I often see applications...e-mails from reviewers coming in at 2 in the morning which is when they're able to get to that application to review it. They're making time for it and they spend six to eight hours per application on average to do a thorough review and prepare their critiques. So they work very hard for these applications. Then they meet, the meeting is either going to be a live meeting which is becoming less and less frequent or it will be a telephone review, we've also used this sort of video conference format for our review meetings or some other formats we use depending on the size and complexity of the science that is being evaluated. Each review group has an average 10-25 members primarily from academia but again that all depends on the particular area of focus for those applications.

As I said they may meet in different formats to use for the meetings but in all cases the reviewers will have been assigned six to ten let's say on average applications to review within a particular round, they will have four to six weeks to review those applications in the time that they have available to review and write up their critique and submit those critiques and again in the eRA Commons system so they can be viewed by other reviewers from the same committee. So not all members of the review panel would view all applications in the review panel they focus on the applications where they have the most expertise, however everyone in the review panel after the discussion will provide a score for the application so the reviewers are also responsible for making sure that in presenting information about a grant application at a review meeting that their information is complete enough for the other reviewers to make an informed judgment

about the appropriate priorities for overall impact score for the grant application. Some of the review committees particularly at the CSR will review as many as 100 applications and one review group and one study section those meetings can be up to three days and even with a three day meeting they typically only discuss about half of the applications, the other half is considered in the bottom half and they are not discussed and we spent 10 to 15 minutes discussing an application. Very brief the reviewers really need to be very clear on their comments but it's as much time as we simply allow given the fact that we have a lot of applications to go through and the reviewers can only spend so much time in the meeting and away from their regular academic responsibilities. So what does it take to be a peer reviewer, typically reviewers are people who have been successful in grant funding, doesn't necessarily need to be NIH grant funding but we need to show they have been able to be successful in their scientific endeavors. So they have demonstrated scientific expertise for the specific grant applications to review, they typically have a doctoral degree or equivalent but that may depend on expertise and they need to show mature judgment and work effectively in a group context and really show breadth of perspective. We tend to steer away from reviewers who are very single-minded in their interest areas and their topic areas, we want people who can think more generally about the public health impact of areas of science that may be different somewhat from their...where they're most comfortable. Reviewers do have to stretch as well and look at the science as a whole as well as evaluating specific areas of science. They absolutely need to be impartial but the...and to demonstrate impartiality we do have them check for conflicts of interest as part of the reviewing process before the applications are assigned.

So we asked the reviewers to look through the list of applications, look to the people who are listed on the application and identify any potential conflicts of interest based on the institutions involved in the applications and based on the individuals involved in the applications. Their impartiality is going to be very important to make sure that the applications receive a fair review. They have to be interested in surveying and which means they tend to be very good citizens because they tend to be very busy people who are finding time in their very busy schedules to add this to their work load. So this is where we can often have difficulty getting the best reviewers because it is hard to get people who are the most interested in serving and they have to adequately represent different constituencies, we need adequate representation of women and

minority scientists as well as diverse representation geographically so we can't have nobody coming from Boston for a review panel because it doesn't really represent the full range of the scientific institutions across the country. We'll try to speed up a little bit, so what do reviewers have to do, I've gone over this a little bit they read the application, they provide, critique and also determine scores for our overall impact, overall potential impact of the application so we have federal review criteria and these are the standard review criteria that you may have seen for a standard grant application so viewers are asked to evaluate the public health significance of grant applications, the strength of the investigative team, the potential for innovation whether that technological innovation, methodological innovation, theoretical innovation of the grant application. The approach, the actual methods that are being used and how well they fit with the goals of the application, the research environment and the potentially clinical environment within which the research is to be completed. They're asked to evaluate human subjects and gender minority and child inclusion plans or whatever animal plans if this is on a nonhuman project. Then they take all of these various, all of these criteria and pull them together in evaluating the overall potential impact of the application to make a sustained and powerful impact in the research field or/and public health and public health practice.

Now the overall impact can be determined by all of the factors together or by specific factors that really drove the score. Outside of the overall impact score they're also asked to evaluate the budget and other considerations for instance in a career development award they would be asked to evaluate the training for responsible conduct of research and a research project award they'd be asked to evaluate the appropriateness of the resource and sharing...and data sharing plans. So each of the criteria, the first five criteria receive a score as well, and the scores range from 1 to 9 and let's go back to that...the scores range from 1 to 9 with a 1 being an exceptional performance in a particular criterion or an exceptionally high potential impact for the...of the application. A 1, 2, or 3 would indicate a high impact whereas a 4, 5, and 6 would indicate a moderate impact. On criterion scores a 4, 5, and 6 would indicate a number of major to significant weaknesses in what would otherwise be a very strong application where a 1, 2 or 3 on a criterion might indicate an application that was very strong with minor to potentially moderate weaknesses. So those are the scores that the reviewers need to come up with, it is all integer scoring. Now there are some other ways the reviewers can vote besides giving a score to an application and those are listed at the

bottom here. The most commonly used is ND for not discussed, as I said we typically only discuss the top half of applications under consideration within a particular review group because we just don't have time to discuss all of them and so we're discussing the most meritorious. The people who are not discussed, that bottom half will still receive their full critiques and their criterion scores, they just won't have an overall resume of the discussion and will not have an overall impact score but they do have the opportunity to revise and resubmit. A not discussed application does not mean it was the bottom of the barrel because often times that top half split will occur right about here so that we're only discussing the high impact applications but ones that will still be considered very good, we don't have the time to discuss so very worth your while to revise and resubmit based on what comments you receive for your application even if it was not discussed. So the reviewers write their critiques in standard templates forms that we provide for them that provide bulleted formats and allow them to respond to each of the review criteria in turn. And like I said can discuss the application or not discuss the application. So this is what you'll receive each of the critiques and a summary statement format where if it was discussed it would start with a resume and a summary of discussion, this is something assigned to a review officer prepared based on the overall judgment of the reviewer, the critiques and the discussion that happened in the meeting.

This really will give you the information about why the application ended up with the final score that it did. The description is your abstract from the grant application and then you have your critiques, there will be at least three, there may be as many as five or more critiques depending on the area of science and what types of expertise we needed to include to get all of them...that application. At the end will be an additional resume of the overall protection, the inclusion plan as well as the budget recommendations and there also may be a note in here from the scientific review officer about specific administrative issues. For instance we've become very, very specific about what types of information you can include in your appendix material and what you can include in various sections that are not page limited of your grant application and if you misuse this section in some ways and the application went to review we will add a note saying you've misused these sections don't do it again. In the review meeting we'll tell the reviewers to ignore those sections of the application that were inappropriately placed and should have been part of the research design. I just want to go back here, so again in your review meeting you will

have discussions for the top half of the applications we will not discuss an application if they fall into the bottom half and you may not be competitive for that round and in occasionally applications will be deferred because the SRO the scientific review officer determines that additional information is needed before an application can be appropriately evaluated. The deferral will mean that the application will be rescheduled for review hopefully within that same council round so the funding position will not be delayed. Post review, generally the scores are released within 24 to 72 hours, we mostly try to get our reviewers to score electronically so we can get those scores out as quickly as possible. Reviewers will have a day or two to edit their critiques to make sure their critiques and their scores are in line with where their opinions were at the end of the review meeting, the scientific review officer will write that resume and summary discussion and if the critique is appropriate, assuming the language is clear and that some restatement within four to six weeks after the review so that a successful to the applicants program officer council. Why does it take four to six weeks after review because sometimes there are 100 applications and we can't guarantee that we can get them done all very quickly because as we're writing the reviews for these applications we're already recruiting for the next round of applications for review, so it's a busy time. So here we are on that same timeline, you've got the study section review, the institutes have looked at those summary statements and the program has made their determination of programmatic relevance and which applications they want to advocate for, for funding, then it goes to the advisory council. This is the second level of the review process.

That scientific review group made up of peer reviewers is designated with identifying the scientific and technical merit of the grant application providing a score based on its merits and to make recommendations regarding level of support and budget, there's specific recommendations that need to be made but it's the second level of review in council that makes the determination about whether this application is programatically appropriate for where the institute is planning to go and will make those final recommendations about funding which the institute director then executes. So I want to go through a few tips for you, this is the important part really of this talk and I'm sorry that I'm going to be a little bit late, please be sure to start early in your application preparation, follow the instructions and read them very carefully within the funding announcement and any additional instructions that you receive from NIH or grants.gov, read

through all of the form materials for the PHS398 forms that you need to complete, make sure you look at any notices that are linked to the funding opportunities that you're interested in so that you're providing all the correct information, you will not be able to change your application once you've submitted it. And your application will not be accepted unless it's submitted by 5 p.m. on the due date. Make sure that you've read through the institutes websites and talk to the program officers about where the institute is interested in going in your scientific area so that you can align your goals to those of the institute which will increase your chances of being considered for funding. Be sure that you're very clear in your application, you only have 6 to 12 pages to be clear about what you want to do, why it's important and that you do have the capability to do that work. Never assume that the reviewers know what you mean, spell out all the acronyms as much as possible, at least the first time and explain a particularly complicated design features, the reviewers don't necessarily understand what you mean and they're not going to other sources to figure it out.

They want the application to read clearly so they can evaluate it easily. Use your space wisely, for instance you only have those 6 to 12 pages for your...describing your research strategy, however you do have the bio, your bio sketch section and that paragraph in the beginning of each of the bio sketches to be able to describe why you're the best person to do the science and for your consultants and co-investigators to describe why they're the best people to help you. The next, facilities and resources section of the application that also does not have a page limit and this is to really designed to describe the scientific environment and the clinical environment which you will be planning to perform the work so this is going to be more than just lab space this could be talking about the scientific centers within which you're working, the community centers within what you'll be doing the research and the facility and resources that you'll have in those areas. So you can use this space to do that and save the research strategy you need to describe your design more fully. But sure to have faculty numbers who have been successful in the NIH grant process, read through your application before you submit it and consider their changes. Be sure to clearly state the rationale for your proposed study, include well designed clear tables of figures, don't try to put too much in there because it may be too small for reviewers to read and that would also annoy them. Present a very organized plan of research so really outline your steps very, very clearly. You want to include a time line and that needs to be

included in that research strategy section. Common errors that I've seen the reviewers complain about are lack of new or original ideas, make sure that your lit review is up to date, check with program officer, check with the NIH reporter website to make sure that there aren't other grants already doing what you want to do. If there's not sufficient scientific rationale and this can often mean theoretical rationale providing a scientific theory for your...for your hypotheses, reviewers will ding your application. If there's lack of connection between your specific aims and methods that you use and if the mission plan is not described in clean crisp pros it needs to be very clear. A problem that often happens particularly with new investigators is proposing unrealistically large amount of work. The reviewers need to be able to trust that you as an investigator can complete the amount of work that you are propose in your application so you need to be able to demonstrate that you can do that work and that's you're not trying to do too much in a small time frame. Think about how long it takes to recruit subjects for a study, how long it takes to develop a protocol, these things cannot be accomplished in a month or so, so you want to be able to consider at. You want to statly clear...clearly state your future directions for the science. So a lot of these you can read through...I really want to be able to allow time for a few questions, what I've provided is just a little bit more information, it goes with the same thing, start early, take advantage of the expertise in your institution and other people you know at the NIH, review your application, read through everything to make sure you're submitting the correct information, feel free to check with me if you're not sure about it, my contact information is at the end and you'll be receiving these slides and some more information about the grants process is on the resources page, I really want to allow time for some questions.

Yeates Conwell: Terrific, thank you very much. We have a question from Camille. Can you see that and just respond?

Marina Broitman: Yes, so going back to slide 7. Looking at early stage investigators, which is somebody who is within ten years of their terminal degree or end of training. Other questions, I know we went through a lot of material quickly.

Yeates Conwell: There's a number of folks here who won't be for some time at the R01 stage clearly and perhaps even R21 or R34. Can you say a little bit about the accordance of

preliminary data, pilot data and how one might think about acquiring a body of research and the process of working towards grant submissions like this?

Marina Broitman: Well, you know I think that your program officers may be able to respond to that better but what reviewers look for like in R01 obviously you need to have some preliminary data, some pilot data to go into a large scale investigation of particular treatment or be it an intervention trial or any other large scale study, you want to show that there's feasibility to do that study. Now the advantage of the smaller applications, the R21, the R03, the R34 that those types of funding opportunities are specifically designed to help you gather those pilot data to try out a particular protocol, to try out...to see whether it's feasible to collect the information that you want to collect, to look more closely at specific areas of your theoretical models to do secondary data analysis to provide pilot data so you can use these smaller two to three year mechanisms. To do that you want to be able to approach the mechanisms based on how this funding opportunities are developed and be very clear about what you'll get during the data to do so you want to be clear about I'm doing this two year grant so that I've got the preliminary capabilities to do this larger study later. You want to be able to include that in your write-up.

Yeates Conwell: Thanks.

Marina Broitman: So Yeates also asked a question about the exceptions to the ten year ESI criterion, yeah if you drop out of your academic career for a time often that's for parenting issues or other family issues issues, maybe clinical time you can apply for an extension for your ESI status and there is information about that on the NIH website, I don't have that handy but if you have questions about that I can find that information for you and I know Lauren has that information, and I know Lauren has that information, and Krystyna could send out the url for that. Okay how does the K or the career development plan process differ from this process? So the Ks are handled differently by different institutions in terms of where they're reviewed at the NIMH Career Development mentored K's and also mid-career K's are reviewed, those that involve mental health intervention and services are within the same review committees as the other K's, the major difference is the focus of the review and how you will write up a structure and those are described in the funding announcement but the focus in the K is on the research

side is diminished and there's a much bigger focus on where you are in your career, how your career development plan fits into where you are in your career so you want that career development plan now to match your aims for your project and to match your goals, you want all those things to line up and the mentors you've chosen are really going to add to your breadth of expertise and help you become an independent investigator so continuing on with the same group of mentors that you've had who you knew post-doc without any major change in what you're planning to do is probably not going to be very successful. You want to show that this case will be taken to the point of independent investigator. Oh, boy okay all right if an ESI wanted to modify and test an existing intervention for different or unique population of the best suited...would that be best suited for that is a question for your program officer, and particularly...yeah I mean that's...so SAMHSA does not do research funding like this they do evaluation funding so their funding areas are very, very different, foundations was another good way to apply for funding, you can look at NIH funding but those types of questions about whether your specific interest area is appropriate for particular mechanisms those are best addressed to your program officer and if you're not sure about it who to contact you're welcome to e-mail me your particular ideas and I can get you in touch with the appropriate program officer but Lauren Hill and Jane Pearson would be obviously be the best people to contact in this case. How does the NIH pilot funding from the previously mentioned sources, well it's not about the NIH it's about how reviewers see it and reviewers like it if you've been successful in obtaining funding elsewhere and have completed...if you've completed the project that you were funded to do then you know that's great, that's aces. They like to see that if you know if it's from a foundation that's fine too, if it's from your institution that's fine too, it never hurts...it's always good to have more funding opportunities. These slides will be up after the webinar and I appreciate that because I do manage to...

Yeates Conwell: I think Bob had his hand up for a moment there.

Bob Pollard: Yeah I just wanted to...I'm glad that the topic of foundations came up and just like to put in a plug for non-NIH sources of funding, the vast majority of research funding has come from the Department of Education for example and there's lots of other opportunities out there besides NIH, I'm certainly not dissing NIH in any way it's the biggest funders we have but I just

want the mentees to recognize there's other sources of funding that may be very fitting to your interests so I would encourage you to think outside NIH when that is appropriate in your view or your mentor's view.

Marina Broitman: Yeah, I definitely agree with that as a representative of NIH.

Yeates Conwell: Okay I...Dr. Marina Broitman we're going to need to let you go because I know you have another commitment and we want to thank you, we all do for taking the time today. If you fill us in on this stuff sometimes it's kind of an obscure complicated system on the outside looking in but this has been really very helpful in clarifying that, thank you very much.

Marina Broitman: Thank you and remember we're here to help you so don't be afraid to contact us.

Yeates Conwell: Bye-bye.

Marina Broitman: Thanks, bye-bye.

**“Call for Papers at the 2013 AAS Meeting”
Discussion Led by Dr. Yeates Conwell
University of Rochester Medical Center
July 18, 2012**

Yeates Conwell: Let's turn to the AAS, because the request, the call for papers came out last week and I think we forwarded that to everybody. And I thought it would be worthwhile to take a few minutes just to go through the different presentation formats, and try to organize ourselves so that everybody who wanted to could participate in the meeting that way. We have, I guess 5 or 6 of the 10 scholars here, so we'll need to certainly continue that discussion in a variety of ways after the end of the webinar here, but we can do the best that we can. OK, Yovanska and Paloma could...Let's see, of the 6 of you here, how many have been to an AAS meeting? That's the first question. And then the 2nd question, oh I'll hold onto for a minute. How do we do that? OK,

there's 1. Jessica has been to 1. And that's it. OK. How about... which of you has presented a paper or a poster at another national meeting?

Good. So AAS is a little different in some respects. The most important way that it's different is the diversity of the people that attend the meeting. It's about suicide and it includes people from a variety of different backgrounds, not just those of us who study suicide, but also clinicians who apply the evidence that we help to provide. It includes volunteers in a variety of capacities who work on hotlines or other places, and includes survivors who are at various stages in their own journeys of trying to understand and put the loss of suicide in their own lives into a proper place. So the dialogue that goes on around those different interfaces is really fascinating, and I think really important for us to be part of. The objective here though is for us, as a group and as individuals, to participate in the meeting actively so that you can get the most out of it. I think that what you take home from the meeting is proportional to what you're able to contribute and engage with while you're in there. Hence the emphasis that we're going to try to make here on all of us putting in some kind of abstract by the October 31 deadline. There are, as you will have seen on page 4 of the requests for papers, the call for papers, 5 different presentation formats. And we... should, I think just look at each and recognize their differences. OK, they're coming up on the screen here. Because there are many different opportunities. The most standard of course are paper presentations and poster presentations. I think you'll all be pretty familiar with that. The descriptions there are 2 and 3, so the paper is an original research presentation based on methodologic collection and analysis of data, and its interpretation application of just in theory or review, or review and synthesis of research. So what AAS does, like most organizations, is solicit papers from anybody that peer reviewed them, and those that are accepted lump them together into sessions that are typically 90 minutes long and have 3 presentations, each 20 minutes long, reserving 10 minutes for comments and discussion. So any one of you certainly is encouraged, if you have a set of data or study results or something to do that would be appropriate to that description, to present that and certainly the BMED advisory board, other mentors, folks would be happy to help you think through and comment on the abstracts that you prepare for submission by that end of October deadline. And before we lose it off the top there, workshops. Workshops are probably less likely to be our focus here because they deal more with evaluation, or focus on a particular clinical paradigm practice or program, and typically we aren't

organized that way for this endeavor. If you've got something that would be appropriate for that then by all means raise it, and we can also try to help you think that through. Back down to 3. Post presentations. Again, that's a terrific way to get involved in the conference because it's really pretty low key and it solicits interactions with a variety of people. You can learn a lot from it and get to meet a lot of people, and it's fun. So where oftentimes one might prepare an abstract and want it to be... indicate your preference that it be as a paper, they might reassign it as a poster in which case you just prepare it differently when you go to the meeting. It's typically, again like a paper based on original research and the analysis of presentation of data in individual format. OK. And then the final 2, panel discussion and research symposium. This is what we begin to talk about when we solicited some ideas that several of you might be interested in collaborating on to put together one or the other of these. I think, let's think together about that. The panel discussion I think is probably mostly accessible to us in some respects. It's 3-5 speakers who present a number of perspectives about, or discuss a common topic or theme from research practice or applied research. So it's very broad. It is 45 or 90 minutes, so it can move along very briskly. It presents different perspectives but they do need to be compelling and highly thematically related. It's about a group of people coming together to flesh out some important ideas through discussion, presentation and discussion, important to the field of suicide research and prevention. They give examples here of describing a program, or programmatic initiative, clinical case presentations, or demonstrations, updates on a status and progress of research projects currently underway. There's a panel moderator and you make sure you have lots of time for interaction. So seems to me that if we got creative that there would certainly be opportunities for 3 or 5 of you to come together, perhaps with the discussions, or if you chose to, and talk about some area of common interest, each from a distinct perspective. So let's just bat around that idea for a minute. We talked about 3 general ideas, and we don't need to go with these although there was some interest in LGBT adolescence and the intersection between LGBT status, identity development, and suicide in diverse populations. Another on suicide in the military, and then a somewhat more general theme identified of interest and protected factors, and suicide in minority adolescents. So anybody want to kick off the discussion about what a panel might look like, for example, around the theme of suicide in the military? Or any other? Camille?

Camille Quinn: Yes I actually have been in communication with both John and Amanda, and we were kind of discussing ideas and what... we kind of had some conversation about, was thinking about this in like a macro and a micro perspective. Both Amanda and John have a significant interest in looking at a program or a service level in detention centers related to suicide of youth in terms of assessment, screening for it and there being some variation related to that. And I'm also interested in the micro piece which will be looking at protective factors related to minority youth. So I'm particular that could look like... even though there's some racial bias, or over representation I should say, of minorities in detention centers. Some minority youth do not necessarily complete suicide. So that's kind of the extent that we've kind of batted around. We've not actually had a conversation about it yet, but have had some good discussion through base camp.

Yeates Conwell: Thanks. That sounds great. Without... suggesting that there's any right one way to approach it, but just purely as an exercise in thinking. So a panel discussion could then be organized potentially around the theme of detention centers, suicide risk in detention centers for example, or it could take a different more specific approach. The suicide in minority youth in the criminal justice system. These are, the ideas of the detention center as a focus is, I think, pretty compelling. AAS has a pretty strong interest historically in high risk populations, and including in jails and prisons and other such study. So a panel discussion might, just for example have 1 person who described what the criminal justice system looked like for kids, and where specifically detention centers sat in that constellation. Somebody else who could talk about the epidemiology and risk factors for suicide among minority youth, or the, I guess the demographic profile of people in detention and what we know about suicide risk. And somebody might talk about proposed preventative intervention based on a review of the literature for that, but informed by theory about the special issues concerning minority youth. I'm just thinking out loud here to help illustrate what we might want to be trying to do here.

Camille Quinn: I think those are some great ideas. I'm very familiar with Linda Teplin's work. She does not necessarily look at suicide specifically in terms of data, but I do know that at least as of late she had not necessarily been willing to release her data, because I did have a conversation with her about that in terms of looking at her data from her dissertation. But she

may have moved beyond that now. So I'm not sure, maybe if someone with a little more status and "juice beneath" approached her maybe she would be more amenable to it. I don't know.

Yeates Conwell: Yeah. Again one of the advantages of panel presentation is you don't necessarily need data as long as it is otherwise really kind of tightly organized around theory, and or public health significance, or a problem with implications for how the field should tackle it. You've got to remember the audience here which is very, very broad and would include people who have some clinical responsibility in the detention centers, or for policy around addressing the issue of suicide in criminal justice settings. So Krystyna has a note there, maybe some offline comment about maybe the... contact around that would be useful. Maybe we can figure out who typically goes there. The AAS also has some special interest in this area. The folks interested in the LGBT question that we had written down were John and David, Jessica and Yovanska potentially. Not sure where that stands without John and David here, but Jessica or Yovanska, can you bring us up to speed on that? Is there anything new happening there or any other ideas percolating?

Jessica Mackelprang: Hello, can you hear me?

Yeates Conwell: Yeah.

Jessica Mackelprang: OK, great. So David and John and I are in the preliminary stages of starting to just as ideas and also potential datasets that we might be able to use to consider issues specific to LGBT populations, in that John has a particular area focus in African American individuals. I'm interested in other at risk groups such as homeless individuals where there's an over representation of LGBT youth, and so I think we're starting to dialogue a little bit around how might we potentially create a panel focusing on LGBT youth, specifically and then perhaps considering club populations within that group. Again, very preliminary stages. Yovanska if you're... I believe you're here, yes if you're interested as well definitely let us know. We'll start linking you up on our email dialogue.

Yeates Conwell: Thanks Jessica. Just to throw out there without necessarily volunteering them. I don't know if they're going to go to the meeting. I hope so. Two folks here that are heavily involved in research in that area, one is one of our current post docs, John Blosnich. He's a public health doctorate, and so looking at health disparities related to sexual minority populations and suicide in particular, and has a lot of developing expertise on that including in the military and the VA population. And then 1 of our faculty members in the center here Vince Silenzio, is a primary care doctor and researcher and social networks and suicide in the LGBT community. So if either of them would be potential resources to you, let me know and I'd be happy to help create the link. I will... I will type those in, very soon. Any other ideas? One thing I was thinking about, but is very particular to those of you who are Hispanic whether there's an opportunity, or more specifically the people who bug you from PR. Would there be a place for panel discussion about suicide in that community or something? If we could either get Dr. Bernal to discuss something like that, or Dr. Zayas in the broader theme of suicide in Hispanic youth or something like that. Since it will be in Austin and that is the new home for Luis Zayas, who is the new dean of the School of Social Work at UT Austin, and one of the leading researchers there. OK. I wonder if there are other things. Lauren, did you have something to say?

Lauren Hill: I just had a process question in making it too early for people to know. Does it seem like this is the process of actually submitting, for the panel discussion, how much assistance do people think they're going to need on that? Like, you know, do the groups feel like they have what they need and they understand what's being asked and they can just press forward, it's just a matter of getting going, or if they're kind of... the folks want more hands on consulting around this process. I'm just kind of curious. And what made me think of it was mentioning the people who are maybe just a titch further along in the pipeline, they may be willing to consult in some fashion to help put these panels together. Just a thought.

Yeates Conwell: Go ahead Jessica.

Jessica Mackelprang: So I have this fair amount of experience submitting proposals for both papers and posters type session, panel discussion abstracts are something that I've never done before so I'm not sure. I see that you have the description up there, but I'm not sure how different

a panel submission might look versus a paper or poster. So I think that that would, for me personally, kind of influence how much support I think would be really helpful. I don't know if you have some thoughts on that?

Krystyna Isaacs: So Yeates, I think the learning objective comes out of the funding mechanisms, maybe for the AAS has. I do know that's something that the evaluations are always based on. And do you have examples of learning objectives that you've submitted for your, like, SRI that people could look at and model on?

Yeates Conwell: Yeah, probably. I mean, I... I could come up with that. I think the learning objectives is a great example. It serves a couple of purposes. One is that they're necessary for the CME or CPE credit process, so they try to build it into the abstracts in order for them to be able to say whoever goes to that session will have met the requirements to be eligible for getting CPE. But beyond that it's also very placed to a couple of bullet points, highlight what the objectives are putting together a panel like this. So it's the place where around the one we were just talking about for example, regarding detention centers might be to... understand the structure of the detention center, or the position of the detention center as a component of criminal justice system. And then the 2nd might be to understand the... discuss the prevalence and coalescence risk factors for suicide among adolescents in detention in particular as it relates to their minority status or some such, or might be to discuss opportunities for prevention and then contact. So really gets very quickly to the point of each component. That's really all we're getting at. Happy to help with that kind of thing.

Krystyna Isaacs: Do you think it would be too quick to say that would be a goal for next week's meeting, to have some roughed out learning objectives? Because next week Camille is speaking, and then we also have time to discuss the symposia panel sessions. So maybe if the various groups came with some sample learning objectives roughed out, that would help with the process?

Yeates Conwell: If people feel ready for that. I'm not sure that they do. It would be a terrific way to use some time. What I want to be sure is that we don't preclude people from putting in poster

and paper presentations. You shouldn't feel constrained by any of this from going ahead with your own individual proposal, and we'd be happy to think with you about that as well. But Camille, let's just see what you can do with John and... who else was in that group? Linda, right? No, not sure who it was. See what you can do... OK. If you'll just kind of press ahead a little bit, see how far you can get in the next week putting some ideas together, and then we can use that as an example, or continue to flesh it out or not depending on where you go to. OK, thank you. So I'm imagining that the events could... you are having a somewhat frustrating experience today? Is some instability in the line or something? Anyway we apologize for that. Krystyna were there other things that you wanted? Oh Ann Marie, do you have something you want to say?

Ann Marie Hernandez: OK, great. I'm sorry, I haven't been able to say a couple of points so I'm kind of late in the game; I being I think your idea about looking at the Hispanic population and suicide risk would be great for... I'm interested to hear what the group from Puerto Rico, if they'd like to join in on that. The other trial I was considering was if you had suicide in the military from various ethological perspectives. That's something that Dr. Claassen and I have been discussing lately, and so I thought it would warrant a discussion. I think it could be potentially interesting for this conference, and I guess it's just kind of open call if anyone is interested in working on that. Let me know.

Yeates Conwell: Good, thanks. Yeah we had some indication that Ricardo and Paloma had interest in that. So you certainly want to reach out to them this week, see what you can do.

Ann Marie Hernandez: OK, thank you.

Yeates Conwell: That's... as you know, because of where you are and exposure that you've gotten so far, and know how important that topic is nationally, and AAS is an excellent place to be keeping people up to date on what the critical issues are there. So very good. OK I think we've probably done our business here today. Are there any other comments you'd want to make before we sign off?

Jessica Mackelprang: I have a quick question. About the ADP presentation, about how long should we plan to speak?

Yeates Conwell: Krys, what did we allocate for that?

Krsytyna Isaacs: The usual thing is there's a webinar and then there's like 45 minutes after the webinar. So I'm thinking... 10-15 minutes, because we still have questions and feedback. Does that sound about right?

Yeates Conwell: Yeah.

Krystyna Isaacs: Normally there's 3 people so when Camille's all by herself on the 25th, so you don't have to fill up 90 minutes Camille... because we're going to do more symposium discussion.

Yeates Conwell: I think typically we are ending the webinars more around 1:00, leaving a half an hour for a couple of people. Or 1 anyway. So yeah, I think 10-15 minutes max is good. What are you referring to there Krystyna?

Krystyna Isaacs: Oh, Camille or one of the people is saying should I have a slide? And I was saying yes, a slide would be good, something to look at. And I don't know if Yovanska's problems and Paloma at the hospital. I think it might have been related with the video feed. So I'm not sure that we should use video with that. I know it's very nice to see the face, so what I did was you right click on your own name, you can load a picture with your profile. Jeff can show you how to do it, and so whenever you're talking your picture shows up. Like right now my picture's showing up. The machine automatically does that, so it's like a poor man's video. And that might be a better way for us to do it, just so that when we all do meet in April next year we'll know what we look like. But I'm afraid, I hate for Yovanska and Paloma to keep dropping out, and I think the video feed was part of the problem with today's internet. And did you want to talk a little bit about just the whole registration process, and holding off? I don't actually think it's

possible to register for the April meeting, but didn't you want people to hold off, Yeates, until we figure out how to get everybody the lower discounted rate?

Yeates Conwell: Yeah. Yeah, maybe because Yovanska has not been able to be here, including for your most recent comments. Maybe you or Jeff can follow up with her with those folks with that suggestion about the picture versus the video, that's great. Yeah, so the registration for AAS is really very expensive, and what we do typically is make a case that our post docs and such are... are eligible for the student rate. That should be true no matter how advanced you are, and we've got some folks here in faculty positions and so on. Don't let that deter you from letting us help you get the student rate. So in order to do that, and also because we need to figure out as we go along here who's going to be going to the meeting and so on, we will try to coordinate registration for the AAS conference through our office here at U of R. So if you are thinking about registering, let us know, hold off. We don't have that opportunity yet. You have to later in the year, the registration materials come out and we'll pick this discussion up then. OK.