



APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS: INNOVATIVE, DEVELOPMENTAL, & EXPLORATORY AWARDS (IDEA)

CBCRP will not extend the submission deadline!

Step #1: Electronic submission: the deadline for submission of the complete application is Thursday **January 14, 2010** (12 noon Pacific Standard Time = 3 pm Eastern Standard Time as shown on proposalCENTRAL's Web site)

Step #2: Face Page submission with signatures:

- Print your application's Face Page from proposalCENTRAL and obtain the necessary signatures (PI and institutional signing official are required).
- E-mail as a PDF attachment a scanned copy with signatures to: facepage@cabreastcancer.org before 5 pm (PST) by Thursday **January 21, 2010**

Important Reminders

- When preparing your application be sure to use the "validate" function to assure that all required submission items are entered.
- You must select an institution with a tax ID (EIN) number in the Proposal Section called "Institution & Contacts." In addition, the "signing official", "contracts & grants official", and "fiscal contact" must be selected from the pull down menu for that institution or have them register with proposalCENTRAL prior to submission. Work with your signing and contracts officials to both identify your institution (duplicates might be present in proposalCENTRAL).

Contents

Overview.....	page 2
List of application submission items.....	page 2
IDEA application requirements.....	page 3
Junior investigators.....	page 4
Duration/budget.....	page 4
Peer review evaluation criteria (scientific merit).....	page 5
Programmatic review criteria.....	page 5

Overview

CBCRP offers the IDEA to encourage researchers to pursue new, innovative projects and to think beyond the “incremental advances” that are typical of most grant applications. Thus, we wish to inspire research that, although untested, may reveal **breakthroughs or new avenues of investigation**. For this purpose we define “innovative” as:

- Applying **novel methods and approaches** to breast cancer research.
- Challenging existing paradigms or developing **new paradigms**.
- Considering an existing problem from **a new perspective**.

In addition, we **encourage junior investigators** to initiate their own innovative projects and researchers new to breast cancer to **enter the breast cancer field**.

List of application submission items

Portions of the application are prepared using pre-formatted Web pages in proposalCENTRAL. For other portions you must use CBCRP forms that are completed then uploaded as PDF attached files to your application (see below).

► **proposalCENTRAL formatted pages** (complete the Web formatted pages with special attention to required items marked with a *****)

Title Page

Enable Other Users to Access this Proposal (only if you want others to be given access)

Applicant/PI (include percent effort in grant)

Institution & Contacts (add signing official, C&G, and fiscal contacts. They are automatically included on the Face Page)

Abstracts (copy the text for Lay & Scientific abstracts from the CBCRP forms. Add/select CSO codes, key words, and one CBCRP priority issue)

Budget Summary (same amounts as uploaded in the form listed below)

Organization Assurances (complete only the Human Subjects and Vertebrate Animals items)

► **Uploaded (attached) CBCRP forms** (i.e, templates): download, read our instructions carefully, complete the form, convert to PDF, then upload the PDF files as attachments to your proposal under the link in proposalCENTRAL called “Research Plan and Other Attachments” (those forms indicated in **bold** are required). The forms and instructions will also be available from CBCRP’s Web site under the “apply” link.

Lay Abstract

Scientific Abstract

Program Responsiveness

Critical Path & Additional Criteria

Distinction from Other Funding

PI Biographical Sketch & Other Support

Budget Summary (note: separate .xls & PDF uploads are required)

Budget Justification and Facilities

Key Personnel

Other Key Personnel Biographical Sketches & Other Support (if needed)

Research Plan (7 page limit + up to 3 additional pages for references)

Milestones

Human Subjects (if needed)

Vertebrate Animal Subjects (if needed)

Appendix List (if needed)

❖ **Other**

Upload appendix items (publications, etc.), as needed. 30-page limit!

IDEA application requirements

The intent of the IDEA is to support speculative, exploratory, “high-risk/high-reward” projects with a primary focus on breast cancer. Applications for this award type should either: (i) challenge existing paradigms, or (ii) encourage innovation by the incorporation of techniques, approaches, and collaborations not yet well represented in mainstream breast cancer research. We encourage researchers to attempt breakthroughs that, if successful, could be leveraged into more substantial funding. Preliminary data in breast cancer is not required for an IDEA application, but we encourage PIs to include sufficient data (obtained in their laboratory or research group) to demonstrate feasibility for the proposed research. It is not an absolute requirement for an IDEA project to be hypothesis-driven, and we consider correlative and data-gathering projects to be responsive to this award type. However, **to be maximally responsive to the IDEA funding mechanism the applicant must either be previously trained and have published in breast cancer or collaborate with an established breast cancer researcher**. The Program and peer review committees will consider applications from researchers outside of breast cancer who propose novel research, but we require them to establish breast cancer relevance as the primary aim and to describe the “critical path” that links their research to breast cancer. To qualify for future consideration for an IDEA competitive renewal, the applicant should identify the “milestones” to be completed in the first phase of the project.

Examples of research **not responsive** to the IDEA are projects that: (1) propose incremental advances for the underlying topic, (2) duplicate the aims of completed or funded research to the PI derived from non-breast cancer studies without incorporating

detailed breast cancer-specific justification, (3) overlap in topic and aims with current grant support to the applicant, or (4) represent portions of existing grants or are derived from cut-down larger, R01-type projects.

Note to basic science applicants: If a molecular pathway has not been established to be relevant to breast cancer, then the primary point of the study should be to test this relevance. Make this aim #1 in your application. We discourage applications with an entirely “reductionist” rationale (i.e., the concept that the entire subject of breast cancer can be understood solely by analysis at the molecular level). It is necessary for basic science researchers to justify the discovery and study of each piece of the puzzle by explaining it in the landscape of breast cancer. Use the “Critical Path” item to tell us why the proposed research is on a “critical path” to translation and impact on those with or at risk for breast cancer.

Junior investigators

IDEAs are open to both established and “junior investigators.” The purpose of making IDEAs available to “junior investigators” is to allow them to initiate their own innovative research projects. To qualify as a “junior investigator” the PI should be at a career level **on the submission date** past postdoctoral fellowship (or equivalent) and **less than three years as an independent investigator** (e.g., Assistant Professor or equivalent). This category is not intended for career development. If the applicant is working in a common facility or research group and under the direction of a senior researcher, then the proposed research must be distinct from the grant support to the supervisor. Thus, the application cannot contain duplicate aims or overlap with the supervisor’s other grant support.

If you are applying as a “junior investigator”, then indicate “yes” in the box at the bottom of the Proposal Section called “applicant/PI.” Next, the applicant should address their qualifications for the “junior investigator” designation using the Program Responsiveness template. During the application’s peer review the junior investigator status of the PI will be taken into consideration. Primarily, the review committee will use special criteria when scoring the “feasibility” component of the merit score. This will place less weight on the PI’s track record, and more weight on resources and collaborations. Finally, if you are working under the supervision of a more senior researcher, then name this person on the Appendix List, and provide this person’s biosketch with other grant support as a portion of the appendix.

Duration/budget

The **maximum duration is 1.5 years and the direct costs budget cap is \$100,000 or \$150,000** (projects using animal or human subjects). Use the following guidelines for placing your project into the appropriate IDEA award cap category:

Higher cap: \$150,000 (animal or human subjects) for studies where the use of human or vertebrate subjects is integral to the specific aims of the project. Specifically:

- Human subjects studies, surveys, and data acquisition requiring institutional IRB-approval and an informed consent form.

- Use of vertebrate subjects and experiments that require an institutional animal assurance approval. This would include animal tumor and metastasis models, ‘knock-out mice’, and studies where tumor growth/metastasis is inhibited by novel therapies.

Lower cap: \$100,000 for studies not using animal or human subjects and for those using animal and human subjects as follows:

- Vertebrate subjects used in a minor portion of the project, such as generation of antibodies.
- Using existing data sources, such as patient and cancer databases.
- Use of archival breast cancer material, such as ATCC-type cell lines or stored tumor materials, generally under the ‘exempt’ categories of IRB approval.

Full indirect (F&A) costs are allowed for IDEAs only to non-UC institutions. The **minimum PI effort must be at least 5% FTE**. IDEA grants have **\$10,000 cap for equipment**.

Peer review evaluation criteria (scientific merit)

IDEA applications, including those from junior investigators, are peer reviewed and rated independently for four separate components.

- **Innovativeness.** The extent to which the basic concept and hypotheses are speculative, exploratory, develop new paradigms, and are high risk/high reward. The extent to which the research incorporates multi-disciplinary elements and collaborations.
- **Impact.** The extent to which the project, if successfully carried out, would make an original and important contribution to advancing the research topic along the “critical path” to defeat breast cancer. Note to basic science applicants: If a molecular pathway has not been established to be relevant to breast cancer, then the primary point of the study should be to test this relevance.
- **Approach.** The extent to which the conceptual framework, design, methods and analyses are developed, well integrated and appropriate to the aims and stated milestones of the project.
- **Feasibility.** The extent to which the investigators can achieve their stated milestones and have maximized their chances for success through demonstrated skill, knowledge, expertise, appropriate resources, and collaborations. For **junior investigators** resources and collaborations are emphasized, and less weight is placed on research background, publications, and “track record.”

The Review Committee will also evaluate the application for **budget and duration**, human/animal **research risks** and institutional approval.

Programmatic review criteria

This review is conducted by the advisory Breast Cancer Research Council. The individuals on the Council performing this review include advocates, clinicians, and scientists from a variety of disciplines. In performing the Programmatic Review the advisory Council first evaluates **only a portion of the application materials**. Pay

careful attention to the instructions for each form underlined below. **Programmatic criteria and definitions:**

- **Response to priorities.** How responsive is the proposed research to CBCRP priority issues? [The advisory Council will compare the PI's statements on Program Responsiveness template, top section) and the content of the abstracts to the CBCRP priority issues and examples.]
- **Response to award type.** How responsive is the project and PI to the stated intent of the selected award type? [The advisory Council will compare the PI's statements on Program Responsiveness template, bottom section) to the CBCRP award type criteria.]
- **Critical Path/translation.** The degree to which the applicant's statements on Critical Path/Additional Criteria template provides a convincing argument that the proposed research fits into and advances a critical path for translation and impact on breast cancer. What barriers must be overcome to take the project to the next level, and what plans are provided for to address these barriers?
- **Underfunded.** The degree to which the PI on Distinction from Other Funding template has highlighted the unique aspects of the proposed research from their own projects (past and present) and the research by others. Is the research relatively underfunded by other agencies, or not funded?
- **Quality of the lay abstract.** Does the Lay Abstract clearly explain in non-technical terms the research background, questions, hypotheses, and goals of the project? Is the relevance to breast cancer understandable?
- **Addressing the needs of the underserved.** Do the project and the PI's statements on Additional Criteria template demonstrate how this research will address the needs of the underserved (including those that are underserved due to factors related to race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, geographic location, sexual orientation, physical or cognitive limitations, age, occupation and/or other factors)?
- **Advocacy- sensitivity and inclusion.** Does the PI express sensitivity to and awareness of the human issues involved in the research and the concerns of breast cancer advocates? Has the PI committed him/herself to be proactive in disseminating the research to the lay audience? Does the research include advocates? Have advocates been involved in the choice of the research questions, the design of the project, or plans for conducting the research? [The advisory Council will examine the PI's statements on the Lay and Scientific Abstracts and Additional Criteria templates.]

It is a combination of, (i) the programmatic rating, and (ii) strengths and weaknesses in both the average scientific merit and individual components of scientific merit that determines a decision to recommend funding.