

**AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY  
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH GRANTS  
POLICIES AND INSTRUCTIONS  
EFFECTIVE JANUARY 2018**

**ELECTRONIC APPLICATION DEADLINE: APRIL 2, 2018**

**PAPER APPLICATION COPY DEADLINE: APRIL 3, 2018**

**AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY, INC.  
Extramural Grants Department  
250 Williams Street, NW, 6th Floor  
Atlanta, GA 30303-1002**

**Voice: (404) 329-7558**

**Fax: (404) 417-5974**

**Web site: <http://www.cancer.org>**

**Email: [grants@cancer.org](mailto:grants@cancer.org)**

**[APPLICATION CHANGES](#)**

**PLEASE NOTE: Recent changes to the Institutional Research Grant Policies and Instructions and application templates are noted in text that is blue.**

**MISSION**

**The American Cancer Society's mission is to save lives, celebrate lives, and lead the fight for a world without cancer.**

# INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH GRANTS

## POLICIES

## CONTENTS

1.	OVERVIEW OF THE EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING GRANTS PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY .....	4
2.	AUTHORITY FOR MAKING GRANTS.....	9
3.	SOURCE OF FUNDS .....	9
4.	WHO MAY APPLY .....	10
5.	COLLABORATIONS WITH ACS INTRAMURAL SCIENTISTS (IF APPLICABLE).....	10
6.	ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.....	11
7.	TOBACCO-INDUSTRY FUNDING POLICY .....	12
8.	PEER REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.....	13
9.	APPLICATION DEADLINES.....	14
10.	NOTIFICATION OF APPLICATION RECEIPT AND REVIEW .....	16
11.	GRANT MANAGEMENT AND PAYMENTS .....	16
12.	ANNUAL AND FINAL PROGRESS REPORTS .....	17
13.	PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER RESEARCH COMMUNICATIONS.....	17
14.	FINANCIAL RECORDS AND REPORTS .....	18
15.	EXPENDITURES .....	18
16.	OWNERSHIP OF EQUIPMENT .....	19
17.	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS .....	19
18.	EXTENSION OF TERM OF GRANT/TRANSFERS/LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....	22
19.	CANCELLATION OF GRANT.....	23
20.	DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH GRANTS .....	23
21.	TERM OF THE AWARD .....	27
22.	ALLOCATION AND EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS .....	27
23.	INDIRECT COSTS .....	28
24.	CHANGE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR.....	28
25.	REQUIRED PROGRESS REPORTS .....	28
26.	REQUIRED FINANCIAL REPORTS.....	29
	APPENDIX A: ANSWERS TO FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS .....	30

APPENDIX B: GUIDELINES FOR MAINTAINING RESEARCH AND PEER REVIEW  
INTEGRITY .....35

APPENDIX C: INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING DELIVERABLES: .....44

## **1. OVERVIEW OF THE EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING GRANTS PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY**

With a primary focus on beginning investigators, the American Cancer Society's Extramural Grants Program seeks to support innovative cancer research across a wide range of disciplines to meet critically important needs in the control of cancer.

Each year, the Society receives approximately 1,500 requests for support of cancer research and for training of health care professionals. All proposals are subjected to multiple levels of rigorous and independent peer review to identify the most meritorious projects for funding.

The Society offers extramural support for research and training via the programs described below. For program specific information, please see Section 20.

### **GRANT MECHANISMS**

#### **RESEARCH GRANTS FOR INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATORS**

**Research Scholar Grants**— Applicants must be independent, self-directed researchers within six years of their first academic appointment. The maximum award is for four years and for up to \$165,000 per year (direct costs), plus 20% allowable indirect costs.

An eligibility exception is in the Priority Focus on Health Equity Research in the Cancer Control and Prevention Research Program, which is restricted to: research studies in psychosocial, behavioral, health policy or health services, which address cancer health equity and disparities. In this case, investigators can be at any stage of their careers. Additionally, only population-based studies that address health equity may propose up to a maximum of 5 years and \$400,000 per year (direct costs), plus 20% allowable indirect costs.

**Institutional Research Grants**—Awarded to institutions as block grants to provide seed money for newly independent investigators to initiate research projects. Grants are made for one to three years and average \$120,000 per year. These grants are renewable.

#### **MENTORED TRAINING AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT GRANTS**

**Postdoctoral Fellowships**—Support for researchers, who have received a doctoral degree to provide training leading to a career in cancer research. Awards may be for up to three years with progressive stipends of \$48,000, \$50,000, and \$52,000 per year, plus a \$4,000 per year fellowship allowance. In addition, \$1,500 will be provided in the last year for travel costs to attend the ACS Postdoctoral Fellows Symposium, if offered that year, or travel to a domestic scientific meeting.

**Mentored Research Scholar Grants**—Provides support for mentored research and training to full-time junior faculty, typically within the initial six years of their first faculty appointment (see Eligibility Criteria - Section 21 of the Grant Policies and Instructions for further information). The goal is for clinicians, who are beginning investigators, to become independent researchers as

clinician scientists. Awards are for up to five years and for up to \$135,000 per year (direct costs), plus 8% allowable indirect costs. A maximum of \$10,000 per year for the mentor(s) (regardless of the number of mentors) is included in the \$135,000. **This mechanism is being phased out in 2018 so only resubmissions will be allowed.**

**Clinician Scientist Development Grant**—Fosters the development of clinicians as clinician scientists. Clinician scientists are investigators licensed to provide patient care and trained to conduct research. They pursue research questions across the cancer research continuum of relevance to improving health. CSDGs provides support for protected time to allow junior faculty who see patients to be mentored and participate in research training to aid their development as independent clinician scientists. Applicants must be full-time and within the first six years of their initial faculty appointment (see Eligibility, section 21 of the Grant Policies and Instructions for further information). Awards range from three to five years and for up to \$135,000 per year (direct costs), plus 8% allowable indirect costs. A maximum of \$10,000 per year for the mentor(s) (regardless of the number of mentors) is included in the \$135,000.

**Physician Training Awards in Cancer Prevention**—Awards to institutions to support physician training in accredited preventive medicine residency programs that provide cancer prevention and control research and practice opportunities. Awards are for four and one-half years in the total amount of \$300,000, based on an average of \$50,000 per resident training year. These grants are renewable.

## **PREDOCTORAL TRAINING**

**Doctoral Training Grants in Oncology Social Work**—Awards to doctoral students to conduct research related to oncology social work. Initial two-year grants providing a stipend of \$20,000 per year with possibility of a two-year competitive renewal.

**Master's Training Grants in Clinical Oncology Social Work**—Awards to institutions to support the training of second-year master's degree students to provide psychosocial services to persons with cancer and their families. The grant term is **two years** with annual funding of \$12,000 (trainee award of \$10,000 and \$2,000 for faculty professional development). These grants are renewable.

**Doctoral Degree Scholarships in Cancer Nursing**—Provide support for study in a doctoral degree program in nursing or a related area, and prepare the graduate for a career as a cancer nurse scientist. The initial award is for two years and provides a stipend of \$15,000 per year. Scholarships may be renewed for an additional two years based on satisfactory progress.

**Graduate Scholarships in Cancer Nursing Practice**—Support for graduate students pursuing a master's degree in cancer nursing or doctorate of nursing practice (DNP). Awards may be for up to two years with a stipend of \$10,000 per year.

## **AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY PROFESSOR AWARDS**

**Research Professor Awards**—Awarded to outstanding mid-career investigators who have made seminal contributions that have changed, and will continue to change, the direction of cancer research. Applicants will have attained the rank of full professor. The awards are for 5 years in the total amount of \$400,000, and may be renewed once.

**Clinical Research Professor Awards**—Awarded to outstanding mid-career investigators who have made seminal contributions in areas of cancer control that have changed, and will continue to change, the direction of clinical, psychosocial, behavioral, health policy or epidemiologic cancer research. Applicants will have attained the rank of full professor. The awards are for five years in the total amount of \$400,000, and may be renewed once.

## **INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM**

**Audrey Meyer Mars International Fellowships in Clinical Oncology**—Support for one year of advanced training in clinical oncology at participating US cancer centers to qualified physicians and surgeons from other countries, particularly countries where advanced training is not readily available. This program is limited to non-US citizens and provides up to US \$65,000 for one year. The annual application deadline is October 15.

## **SPECIAL INITIATIVE**

### **PRIORITY FOCUS ON HEALTH EQUITY RESEARCH IN THE CANCER CONTROL AND PREVENTION RESEARCH GRANTS PROGRAM**

Despite the steady overall decline in cancer incidence and mortality rates in the United States, not all population groups have benefited equally. Differences exist in rates of incidence, prevalence, mortality and related adverse health conditions in subgroups of the US population. If application of the existing knowledge about cancer prevention, early detection and treatment were delivered equally, disparities in cancer could be substantially reduced or eliminated. Achieving health equity by establishing inclusive health and social systems whereby all people are treated equitably creates conditions for improving health outcomes.

The American Cancer Society (ACS) has a longstanding history of advocacy, education, community outreach and research in the area of cancer disparities and continues to recognize the importance of research in the area. As highlighted in reports by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality and the Institute of Medicine, inequitable differences or health disparities are linked to various determinants of health. The determinants of health are interrelated risk factors that extend across the life span to impact health (Braveman, 2014). Environmental conditions—the conditions in which people are born, live, play, thrive, work and worship—and the available systems supporting health comprise the social determinants of health. Integral to these influences are the economic, political and social policies that exist in and shape communities. Besides sociopolitical influences, biology, genetics/genomics and individual

behaviors are also determinants of health. Inequity and health disparities may be further characterized by age, gender, disability status, ethnicity/race, geography, income, language, social class, or sexual orientation. The National Stakeholder Strategy for Achieving Health Equity, supported by the US Department of Health and Human Services Office of Minority Health, presents an action-oriented blueprint to move the nation towards achieving health equity by combating health disparities with a comprehensive, community-driven approach. The ACS has overlapping goals and is committed to addressing cancer health equity through research, education, advocacy and service.

The ACS Extramural Research and Training Grants Department identifies research addressing health equity and health disparities as a priority. Within the Cancer Control and Prevention Research Program of the Department, grant applications in psychosocial and behavioral research and in health policy and health services research focused on achieving health equity and eliminating health disparities are welcome from principal investigators at any career stage. This expanded eligibility is unique to the Priority Area Targeting Health Equity and Health Disparities in Cancer Prevention and Control. Applicants must explicitly specify the following within the application: (1) relevance to cancer generally and cancer disparities specifically; (2) how findings from the proposed research will substantially improve equity in access to cancer prevention, early detection, diagnosis, and/or treatment services; and (3) how findings may be applied to more quickly advance efforts to reduce cancer burden or costs, improve quality of care or quality of life, and/or save more lives. All cancer health equity applications must target two or more determinants of health. Population-based health equity studies must also target two or more levels of influence (individual, interpersonal, organizational, community, or public policy) to propose interventions focused on achieving health equity. (McLeroy et al., 1988; CDC, 2014).

Applications will be accepted using one of four mechanisms: Postdoctoral Fellowship, Mentored Research Scholar Grant, Research Scholar Grant, or Clinical Research Professor.

#### References:

Braveman P. What Are Health Disparities and Health Equity? We Need to Be Clear. *Nursing in 3D: Diversity, Disparities, and Social Determinants*. *Public Health Reports*. 2014 Supplement 2; 129:1-8

McLeroy KR1, Bibeau D, Steckler A, Glanz K. An ecological perspective on health promotion programs. *Health Educ Q*. 1988; 15(4):351-77.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Colorectal Cancer Control Program: Social Ecological Model. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/cancer/crccp/sem.htm>

## **REQUESTS FOR APPLICATIONS (RFAs)**

**Pilot and Exploratory Projects in Palliative Care of Cancer Patients and their Families** — Supports investigators performing pilot and exploratory research studies that test interventions, develop research methodologies, and explore novel areas of research in palliative care of cancer patients and their families. Applications will be accepted via the Pilot and Exploratory Grants Mechanism. The maximum award is for 2 years and up to \$60,000 per year (direct costs) plus 20% indirect costs.

**Research Scholar Grant in the Role of Health Policy and Healthcare Insurance in Improving Access to Care and Performance in Cancer Prevention, Early Detection, and Treatment Services**— Supports investigations evaluating the impact of changes occurring in the health care system with a focus on cancer prevention, control, and treatment. Efforts focusing on improving access to care may also impact inequities that contribute to health disparities. New health public policy initiatives, for example, the new federal and state marketplaces that have expanded insurance coverage, as well as Medicaid expansion in some states, create natural experiments ripe for evaluation. Research to be funded by this RFA should focus on the changes in national, state, and/or local policy and the response to these changes by health care systems, insurers, payers, communities, practices, and patients.

Applications will be accepted via the Research Scholar Grant in Cancer Control and Prevention Program. Award length and budget limits vary; please see the Research Scholar Grant policies and instructions for a detailed description of this RFA.

## **GRANT PROGRAMS**

**HEALTH PROFESSIONAL TRAINING IN CANCER CONTROL** – Virginia Krawiec, MPA, Program Director

This program provides grants in support of nurses, physicians and social workers to pursue training in cancer prevention and control practice. The program's goal is to accelerate the wide application of research findings in cancer prevention and control by increasing the number of nursing and social work clinicians, and researchers and physicians with expertise and career commitment to cancer control.

**MOLECULAR GENETICS AND BIOCHEMISTRY OF CANCER** – Michael Melner, PhD, Program Director

This program focuses on genes involved in cancer and how alterations in those genes (mutations, deletions, and amplifications) play roles in the process. Of particular interest is the examination of the molecules involved in cancer (proteins, nucleic acids, lipids, and carbohydrates) and how their activities affect the disease. The program highlights new targets for prevention, detection, and treatment of cancer.

**CANCER CELL BIOLOGY AND METASTASIS** – Charles Saxe, PhD, Program Director  
The primary goal of this program is to provide an understanding of the nature of cancer cells so they can be more effectively controlled and eliminated. Emphases include understanding the fundamental controls of normal and cancer cells with a focus on how cells regulate when to



grow, when to divide and when to die; how cells create an identity and how cells relate to the local environment and to other cells; how cells regulate when and how to move from one site to another.

**TRANSLATIONAL CANCER RESEARCH** – Lynne Elmore, PhD, Program Director

This program focuses at the interface between laboratory investigations and human cancer. The scope of the program includes investigations of the role of infectious diseases in cancer, microbial-based cancer therapies, the discovery, synthesis, and delivery of cancer drugs, the creation and use of animal models of cancer, and the role of individual or groups of genes in different types of cancer.

**CLINICAL CANCER RESEARCH, NUTRITION, AND IMMUNOLOGY** – Susanna Greer, PhD, Program Director

This research grant program focuses on investigations including basic, preclinical, clinical, and epidemiological studies. Areas of interest include new modalities for cancer prevention, diagnosis and treatment. In addition, the program seeks to improve understanding of cancer-related inflammatory responses, immunosurveillance, and the use of the immune system for cancer prevention and therapy. The program also focuses on exposome links to cancer and increased understanding of the effects of nutrition and the environment on cancer prevention, initiation, progression and treatment.

**CANCER CONTROL AND PREVENTION RESEARCH** –Elvan C. Daniels, MD, MPH, Program Director

This research grant program focuses on the development and testing of interventions to influence health behaviors and health care delivery. Research projects in this program focus on cancer risk reduction and delivery of high quality health promotion, screening, early detection and treatment services. The program also includes projects directed at health services, outcomes and policy research to assess the effectiveness of interventions and impact of policies on access to care, quality of care, and costs of cancer care. Special emphasis is placed on health equity research addressing disparities in disadvantaged groups, and social determinants of health that drive inequities.

## **2. AUTHORITY FOR MAKING GRANTS**

All American Cancer Society grants and awards are made by the Chief Executive Officer on behalf of the Society's Board of Directors.

## **3. SOURCE OF FUNDS**

The American Cancer Society obtains its funds principally from public donations collected annually by our many dedicated volunteers. To disseminate information about the Society's Extramural Research and Training Grants Program to our volunteers and to the public, grantees may occasionally be asked to give brief presentations to professional and lay audiences.

#### **4. WHO MAY APPLY**

Applicants for Clinician Scientist Development Grant and Postdoctoral Fellowships, must at the time of application be United States citizens or permanent residents of the United States. There are no US citizenship requirements for all other grants.

The Society will recognize only one individual as the responsible investigator and, therefore, only one person should be indicated as principal investigator. The Society does not recognize co-principal investigators. The sole principal investigator is responsible and accountable for the overall conduct of the project.

Although applicants may apply for multiple awards, a grantee may not be the principal investigator on more than one ACS Grant at any time. Exceptions are made for recipients of grants that are in response to RFAs and for PIs of Institutional Research Grants.

#### **5. COLLABORATIONS WITH ACS INTRAMURAL SCIENTISTS (IF APPLICABLE)**

- 1) If an extramural scientist is planning a collaboration with an ACS intramural scientist, they may be eligible to submit an application if they meet all other requirement of eligibility. Such collaborations are not required.
- 2) In most cases, the use of ACS research resources will require that at least one ACS intramural scientist is included as a collaborator on a grant application. Therefore prior to submission of an application, the collaboration between extramural scientists and intramural scientists must be established according to the policies and procedures established by ACS Intramural Research.
- 3) Intramural scientists and their staff may participate in grants and contracts in many ways, including:
  - Serving as unpaid consultants, collaborator, co-investigator or mentor. Intramural scientists may not serve as a principal investigator on an ACS grant or contract.
  - Contributing to the conceptualization, design, execution, or interpretation of a research study.
  - Having primary responsibility for a specific aim within a standard research project grant (e.g. RSG).
  - Developing/contributing data for an extramural collaboration.
  - Participating in a multi-institutional collaborative arrangement with extramural researchers for clinical, prevention, or epidemiological studies.
- 4) ACS intramural scientists may not receive salary support, travel expenses, or other funds from ACS-funded grants or contracts.
- 5) The intramural scientist or extramural scientist may have access to reagents, laboratory equipment and/or data to conduct the extramurally funded portion of the research, as established in their collaborative agreement.
- 6) While intramural scientists may write a description of the work to be performed by the intramural department, they may not write an applicant's grant application or contract

proposal. However, intramural scientist should review and approve sections relevant to the collaboration.

- 7) ACS intramural scientist participation must comply with the policies and procedures related to non-disclosure and disclosure regulations as well as conflict of interest.
- 8) ACS intramural scientists must file annual and final research reports related to their activities associate with any grant or contract awarded through the Extramural Grants Department.

<sup>1</sup>Adapted from document NIH Policy 54815 Implementation of Cooperative Agreement, and “Funding of Intramural Research Program/Extramural Research Program Collaborations” [<http://sourcebook.od.nih.gov/ethic-conduct/fund-irp-erp-3-00.htm>], and “Opportunities and Guidelines to Facilitate Scientific Collaborations” [<http://www.niaid.nih.gov/researchfunding/grant/Pages/extraintracollab.aspx>]

## **6. ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES**

The Society’s grants and awards are made to not-for-profit institutions located within the United States, its territories, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. A not-for-profit institution is one that –IF REQUESTED- can provide:

- A current letter from the Internal Revenue Service conferring 501(c)(3) status
- Documentation of an active cancer research program

Grant applications will not be accepted from, nor will grants be made for, the support of research conducted at for-profit institutions, federal government agencies (including the National Laboratories), or organizations supported entirely by the federal government (with the exception of postdoctoral fellowship applications) or organizations, such as Foundations operated by, and for the benefit of, Veteran Affairs Medical Centers, whose primary beneficiaries are federal government entities. Applications may be submitted by qualified academic institutions on behalf of Veteran Affairs Medical Centers, provided that a Dean’s Committee Memorandum of Affiliation is in effect between the two institutions.

The American Cancer Society does not assume responsibility for the conduct of the activities that the grant supports or the acts of the grant recipient as both are under the direction and control of the grantee institution and subject to the institution's medical and scientific policies. Grantee institutions must safeguard the rights and welfare of individuals who participate as subjects in research activities by reviewing proposed activities through an Institutional Review Board (IRB), as specified by the National Institutes of Health Office for Human Research Protections, US Department of Health and Human Services. Furthermore, grantee institutions must adhere to DHHS guidelines as well as ACS guidelines regarding conflicts of interest, recombinant DNA, scientific misconduct, and all other ACS policies and procedures applicable to the grant application and grant. These policies apply to applicants and applicant institutions as well.

To signify agreement by the institution to all ACS policies and procedures, an application for a grant must bear the signature of the official authorized to sign for the institution. Signature of

the department head is also required. Additional signatures are at the discretion of the institution.

The institution is responsible for verifying that all documentation related to the application and/or grant, including all representations made by any named researcher (e.g. position or title), is correct. Further, it is the responsibility of the institution to verify that the applicant is either a US citizen or permanent resident with a Resident Alien Card or “Green Card,” where applicable. If the award does not require US citizenship or permanent residency as an eligibility requirement, the institution is responsible for documenting that the applicant is legally eligible to work in the US for the duration of the award. For postdoctoral fellowships, if the terminal degree is granted after submission of the application, the institution must verify that the degree has been awarded prior to grant activation.

It is the responsibility of the institution to immediately report to ACS any finding that any information presented to ACS in connection with the application and/or grant was false. It is also the responsibility of the institution to immediately report to ACS any action including recertification, loss of certification, breach of conflict, or misconduct, or any change in a named researcher’s employment status with the institution, including administrative leave, which may occur during the term of any award that is pertinent related to the work described in the grant application. Failure to abide by the terms above, or any other ACS policies and procedures in connection with the application and/or grant, may result in ACS suspending grant funding, or canceling the grant, to be decided by ACS in its sole discretion.

**By accepting an American Cancer Society award, you agree to the Guidelines for Maintaining Research and Peer Review Integrity that can be found in the appendix of these policies.**

## **7. TOBACCO-INDUSTRY FUNDING POLICY**

Scientific investigators or health professionals who are funded by the tobacco industry for any project, or whose named mentors in the case of mentored grants are funded by the tobacco industry for any project, may not apply and will not be eligible for American Cancer Society research and training grants. Scientific investigators, health professionals, or named mentors who accept funding from the tobacco industry for any project during the tenure of an American Cancer Society research or training grant must inform the Society of such funding, whereupon the American Cancer Society grant will immediately be terminated. Tobacco industry funding includes: funds from a company that is engaged in, or has affiliates engaged in the manufacture of tobacco produced for human use; funds in the name of a tobacco brand, whether or not the brand name is used solely for tobacco goods; funds from a body set up by the tobacco industry or by one or more companies engaged in the manufacture of tobacco goods.

The following do not constitute tobacco industry funding for the purposes of this policy:

- Legacies from tobacco industry investments (unless the names of a tobacco company or cigarette brand are associated with them);
- Funding from a trust or foundation established with assets related to the tobacco industry but no longer having any connection with the tobacco industry even though it may bear a name that (for historical reasons) is associated with the tobacco industry.

Tobacco industry funding is defined for purposes of Society grants and awards applicants and recipients as money provided or used for all or any of the costs of the research, including personnel, consumables, equipment, buildings, travel, meetings, and conferences, running (operating) costs for laboratories and offices, but not meetings or conferences unrelated to a particular research project.

## **8. PEER REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS**

The Society's Scientific Program Directors distribute the applications to the most appropriate Peer Review Committee and then assign each application to at least two committee members for independent and confidential review. Each committee generally has between 12 and 25 members who are leaders in their areas of expertise, plus up to three “stakeholders.” A stakeholder is an individual usually without formal training as a scientist or health professional who has a strong personal interest in advancing the effort to control and prevent cancer through research and training. This interest could stem from a personal experience with the disease, such as survivorship, a family cancer experience, or being a caregiver.

Depending on the grant applied for (see specific sections), the committees evaluate applications based on some or all of the following criteria: (a) the scientific merit, originality, and feasibility of the application; (b) the qualifications, experience and productivity of the applicant, and the members of the investigative team; (c) the facilities and resources available; and (d) the promise of the research or training as related to the control of cancer or to the benefit to be gained by persons with cancer. At the Peer Review Committee meeting, the most competitive applications are discussed and a priority score is voted. Written evaluations of each application are provided to the Council for Extramural Grants (the Council). The Council is a multidisciplinary panel of senior scientists, many having previously served on a Peer Review Committee, up to three stakeholders, and the Chair of the Society’s Research and Medical Affairs Committee serving as an ex officio, non-voting member. After considering the relative merit of the applications, the amount of available funds and the Society’s objectives, the Council establishes the pay line to determine which grants will be funded during each cycle. No voting member of a Peer Review Committee or of the Council may be a member of the Society’s staff or serve concurrently on the Board of Directors of the American Cancer Society.

**In general, applications that are not funded may be revised and resubmitted twice; postdoctoral fellowship applications may only be resubmitted once.** Resubmitted applications will be reviewed in the same detail and compete on an equal basis with all other new applications. (See Instructions for additional information on resubmission of applications.)

## 9. APPLICATION DEADLINES

Applications for grants and awards must be submitted as paper and electronic copies via proposalCENTRAL. Access is available using links provided in the American Cancer Society web site [www.cancer.org](http://www.cancer.org) (*see Instructions*). The electronic applications must be submitted at the proposalCENTRAL website by close of business (5:00 PM EST) on the specified deadline date. For the convenience of the applicant, a paper copy is due one day after submission of the electronic copy. **If the deadline falls on a weekend or holiday, applications will be accepted the following business day.**

No supplemental materials will be accepted after the deadline unless requested by staff for administrative purposes or when requested by the reviewers.

## DEADLINE, REVIEW, NOTIFICATION, AND ACTIVATION SCHEDULE

GRANTS	Application* Deadline	Peer Review Meeting	Preliminary Notification	Council Meeting	Grantee Notification	Activation
Research Scholar Grant	April 1 October 15	June January	August March	Sept. March	October April	January 1 July 1
Mentored Research Scholar Grant	<b>DISCONTINUED; See Clinician Scientist Development Grant</b>					
Clinician Scientist Development Grant	April 1 October 15	June January	August March	Sept. March	October April	January 1 July 1
Postdoctoral Fellowship	April 1 October 15	June January	August March	Sept. March	October April	January 1 July 1
Pilot and Exploratory Projects	April 1 October 15	June January	August March	Sept. March	October April	January 1 July 1
Institutional Research Grant	April 1	June	August	Sept.	October	January 1
Physician Training Award in Cancer Prevention	April 1	June	August	Sept.	October	January 1
Research Professor Award	LOI Deadline: February 1 Application Deadline: April 1	June	NA	Sept.	October	January 1
Doctoral Training Grant in Oncology Social Work	October 15	January	March	March	April	July 1
Clinical Research Professor Award	LOI Deadline: August 1 Application Deadline: October 15	January	NA	March	April	July 1
Master's Training Grant in Clinical Oncology Social Work	October 15	January	March	March	April	July 1
Cancer Control Career Development Award	<b>DISCONTINUED; See Clinician Scientist Career Development Grant</b>					
Doctoral Degree Scholarship in Cancer Nursing	October 15	January	March	March	April	July 1
Graduate Scholarship in Cancer Nursing Practice		March	N/A	March	April	July 1
Audrey Meyer Mars International Fellowships in Clinical Oncology	October 15	January	March	March	April	July 1

**\*Paper copy is due one business day following the deadline for the electronic copy.**

## 10. NOTIFICATION OF APPLICATION RECEIPT AND REVIEW

Approximately one month after receipt of the application, applicants will receive an email acknowledgment providing an application number, the assigned Peer Review Committee, and the name and telephone number of their Scientific Program Director. This email will be sent to the address in the Professional Profile supplied at the time of submission in proposalCENTRAL. It is important that the address listed in the Professional Profile is a viable mailing address as it will be used to notify you throughout the review and award process.

**Preliminary Notification.** Following review, preliminary information regarding the status of an application will be emailed along with instructions to download copies of the reviewers' critiques. The notification will also indicate the likelihood of funding as described by one of the following phrases: experience suggests that (a) your application has been recommended for funding, (b) we cannot predict the likelihood of funding at this time or (c) your application is not likely to be funded. Please note that all final funding decisions are made by the Council for Extramural Grants which typically meets in March and September.

Applicants may call the Extramural Grants Department at any time during the review cycle. The Program Director and Program Coordinator will shepherd your application through the entire process. Following receipt and careful consideration of the critiques, applicants are encouraged to contact their Program Director to discuss their review. For those applicants considering resubmission, it is strongly encouraged that they contact their Program Director well in advance of the next deadline.

## 11. GRANT MANAGEMENT AND PAYMENTS

New grantees will receive a packet of information which includes instructions for activation of the award. The activation form as well as other important information about the grant can be found at <https://proposalcentral.altum.com>. Select the Award tab to see the Post Award Management Site.

Grant payments will be made at the end of each month, except for nursing scholarships and social work grants, which are made once yearly at the beginning of the year. The American Cancer Society requires that all payments are made to the sponsoring institution and are mailed to the address indicated on the grant activation form. Acknowledgment of payment by the sponsoring institution is not required. Continued funding by ACS throughout the grant period is contingent upon institution complying with all of the terms related to the grant; and failure to comply with all of the grant terms may result in a suspension of grant funding, or cancellation of the grant, to be determined by ACS in its sole discretion.

Personnel compensated in whole or in part with funds from the American Cancer Society are not considered employees of the Society. Institutions are responsible for issuing the appropriate IRS tax filings for all individuals receiving compensation from American Cancer Society grants and are responsible for withholding and paying all required federal, state, and local payroll taxes with regard to such compensation. Any tax consequences are the responsibility of the individual



recipient and the sponsoring institution. We advise all grant and award recipients to consult a tax advisor regarding the status of their awards.

## 12. ANNUAL AND FINAL PROGRESS REPORTS

The following policies apply to Research Scholar Grants, Mentored Research Scholar Grants, and Postdoctoral Fellowships. For all other grants, see the appropriate "Required Progress Reports" sections. Annual and final reports represent a critical part of responsible stewardship of the donated dollars. We greatly appreciate your efforts to assist us in fulfilling this important commitment to our donors.

- A. Both nontechnical and scientific progress reports are to be submitted each year within 60 days after the first and subsequent anniversaries of the start date of the grant, and final reports are due within sixty days after the grant has terminated. To access the necessary forms for annual and final progress reports, please go to <https://proposalcentral.altum.com>.
- B. The final report should cover the entire grant period. In the event a grant has been extended without additional funds, the final report is not due until the official termination date of the grant. If the grant is terminated early, a final report must still be completed within 60 days of the termination date.
- C. Reports are to be submitted in a timely manner. If this is not possible, a written request to extend the reporting deadline must be made. Otherwise, noncompliance may result in the withholding of payment on all grants in effect at the recipient institution until reports are received.
- D. Please note that up to date annual reports are required when requesting any grant modifications including transfers or no cost extensions.

## 13. PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER RESEARCH COMMUNICATIONS

Publications resulting from research or training activities supported by the American Cancer Society must contain the following acknowledgment: "Supported by (insert name of grant and number) from the American Cancer Society." In the event that there are multiple sources of support, the acknowledgment should read "Supported in part by (insert name of grant and number) from the American Cancer Society" along with references to other funding sources. The Society's support should also be acknowledged by the grantee and by the institution in all public communication of work resulting from this grant, including scientific abstracts (where permitted), posters at scientific meetings, press releases or other media communications, and Internet-based communications.

Although there is no formal approval process for publications by Society grantees, **it is helpful if investigators notify their Program Directors when manuscripts have been accepted for future publication.** This will allow ample time to consider and coordinate any additional public or Society-wide notifications. If your institution decides to send out a **press release** involving any of your Society-supported research, please notify the ACS Communications representative (phone number on your award letter) or your Program Director in advance.

ACS grants to you a limited, revocable, non-transferable license to use the ACS logo (as shown below) in association with your funded work. We encourage you to use the following ACS logo on any scientific poster, in a Power Point presentation, or any other visual presentation about your funded work where the ACS is noted as a funding source. In turn, you agree to provide any materials featuring the ACS logo to ACS upon our request.

Permission to use the logo is limited to the uses outlined in the above paragraph. This is not meant to be used to indicate endorsement of products such as guidelines, websites, software for mobile devices(apps), or tool kits, etc.



#### 14. FINANCIAL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A report of expenditures must be submitted within 90 days of the expiration date of the grant as indicated in the award letter. Any change in terms, such as a no-cost extension, will alter the date that the report is due. There are different reporting requirements for the Institutional Research Grant (please see the “Required Financial Reports” section in the IRG policies). Annual financial reports are not required. To access the necessary forms, please go to <https://proposalcentral.altum.com>.

Signatures of the principal investigator and the institution’s financial officer are required. **Any unexpended funds must be returned to the Society.**

Reports are to be submitted in a timely manner. If this is not possible, a written request to extend the reporting deadline must be made. Otherwise, non-compliance may result in the withholding of payment on all grants in effect at the recipient institution until reports are received.

Institutions must maintain separate accounts for each grant, with substantiating invoices available for audit by representatives of the American Cancer Society. The Society is not responsible for expenditures made prior to the start date of the grant, costs incurred after termination or cancellation of the grant, or for commitments against a grant not paid within 60 days following the expiration date, or any expenditure that exceed the total amount of the award. (See also section 19, "Cancellation.")

#### 15. EXPENDITURES

American Cancer Society *research* grants are not designed to cover the total cost of the research proposed nor the investigator's entire compensation. The grantee's institution is expected to provide the required physical facilities and administrative services normally available at an institution.

For grants that allow indirect costs, the calculation of allowable indirect costs includes all budget items except permanent equipment. See the Instructions for allowable expenditures for Health Professional Training Grants (Nursing Scholarships, Social Work Training Grants, Cancer Control Career Development Awards and Physician Training Awards in Cancer Prevention).

**The Society's research grants do not provide funds (direct budget) for such items as:**

- Secretarial/administrative salaries
- Student tuition and student fees including graduate and undergraduate; however, tuition is an allowable expense for the principal investigator of a Clinician Scientist Development Grants.
- Foreign travel (special consideration given for attendance at scientific meetings held in Canada)
- Books and periodicals except for required texts for coursework in the approved training plan for Clinician Scientist Development Grants.
- Membership dues
- Office and laboratory furniture
- Office equipment and supplies
- Rental of office or laboratory space
- Recruiting and relocation expenses
- Non-medical services to patients (travel to a clinical site or patient incentives are allowable expenses)
- Construction, renovation, or maintenance of buildings/laboratories

However, Society research and training grant funds can be used for computer purchases that are for research and training purposes, and can be purchased with direct funds from the equipment budget. See specific policies for different funding mechanisms.

## **16. OWNERSHIP OF EQUIPMENT**

Equipment purchased under American Cancer Society research grants or extensions thereof is for the use of the principal investigator and collaborators. Title of such equipment shall be vested in the institution at which the principal investigator is conducting the research. In the event the American Cancer Society authorizes the transfer of a grant to another institution, equipment necessary for continuation of the research project purchased with the grant funds may be transferred to the new institution. Title to such equipment shall be vested in the new institution.

## **17. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS**

As a not-for-profit organization supported by public contributions, the Society believes it has the responsibility to adopt policies and practices that enhance the likelihood that potentially beneficial discoveries and inventions will be exploited to the benefit of humankind. It is the desire of the Society that such inventions be administered in such a manner that they are brought into public use at the earliest possible time. The Society recognizes that often this may be best accomplished through patenting and/or licensing of such inventions. Accordingly, the Society has adopted the following patent policy that is binding on all Grantees and Not-for-profit Grantee Institutions (hereinafter "Grantee"), excluding postdoctoral fellowship Grantees at the National Institutes of Health and other government laboratories, for whom the applicable patent policies of the federal government shall apply. Acceptance of a grant from the Society constitutes acceptance of the terms and conditions of this policy. It is a goal of the Society that the terms and conditions of this policy not conflict with the established patent policy of Grantee.

- A. All notices required pursuant to this policy shall be in writing, and in this policy, the following terms shall have the meaning set forth below.

- i. "Invention" shall mean any potentially patentable discovery, material, method, process, product, program, software or use.
  - ii. "Funded Invention" shall mean any Invention made in the course of research funded in whole or in part by this Society grant.
  - iii. "Public Disclosure" shall mean any publication, presentation, offer for sale or any activity that would affect the patentability of the invention under 35 USC. § 102 or 103.
  - iv. "Net Income" shall mean gross income received by Grantee in respect of a Funded Invention less inventor distributions in accordance with Grantee policy, payments to joint holders of Funded Invention, and unreimbursed directly assignable out-of-pocket expenses resulting from patenting and licensing for Funded Invention.
- B. Grantee shall notify the Society of each Funded Invention made by Grantee within thirty (30) days after the disclosure of the Funded Invention to Grantee's Technology Transfer Office or the equivalent thereof. Grantee shall promptly determine whether it desires to seek patent or other statutory protection for all Funded Inventions promptly after each Funded Invention is made and shall promptly inform the Society of all decisions to seek or not seek such protection. The Society shall have the right to seek patent or other statutory protection, at the Society's expense, for any Funded Invention in any country where Grantee has decided not to seek protection or has failed to file an application for such protection within six (6) months after disclosure of the Funded Invention to the Society, and, upon the Society's request, Grantee shall file for patent protection for Funded Invention in such countries as directed by Society at the Society's expense.
- C. Grantee shall promptly notify the Society of the filing and issuance or grant of any application for a patent or other statutory rights for a Funded Invention and shall keep the Society reasonably informed of the status and progress of all such applications. Grantee shall pay all costs and expenses incident to all applications for patents or other statutory rights and all patents and other statutory rights that issue thereon owned by Grantee (other than as provided for in Sections B or C). Grantee shall also notify the Society at least sixty (60) days in advance of Grantee's intention to abandon any application for a patent or other statutory right for a Funded Invention or not to take action required to maintain any such application or any patent or other statutory right in a Funded Invention, in which event, at the request of the Society, Grantee shall continue patent protection for Funded Invention as directed by Society at the Society's expense (unless maintenance of such patent rights is inconsistent with Grantee's good name).
- D. Each of the Society and Grantee (the appropriate Grantee technology transfer officer managing Funded Invention) shall promptly inform the other of any suspected infringement of any patent covering a Funded Invention and of any misappropriation, misuse, theft or breach of confidence relating to other proprietary rights in a Funded Invention. Grantee and Society will discuss in good faith further action to be taken in this regard.

- E. Grantee shall notify the Society within thirty (30) days of grant of a license, lease, or other revenue generating agreement involving a Funded Invention. In the event that Grantee fails to license a Funded Invention within five (5) years from the issuance of a patent for the Funded Invention and the Grantee has determined no viable means of commercialization for Funded Invention, Grantee shall license the Funded Invention, with the right to sublicense, to the Society (under standard Grantee license terms on a royalty free basis). However, should the Society receive any revenue from sublicensing the Funded Invention, it will share that revenue with Grantee on a mutually acceptable basis.
- F. Grantee will license a Funded Invention in accordance with Grantee Policy and established practices.
- G.
  - i. The Society waives the receipt of income until the Net Income from the Funded Invention exceeds \$500,000.
  - ii. Once the Net Income from a Funded Invention exceeds \$500,000, Grantee shall pay the Society annually a percentage of the Net Income from the Funded Invention that is proportionate to the Society's proportion of the financial support for the research that resulted in the Invention. Such royalty payment shall be accompanied by an appropriate statement of account detailing the amount and showing the calculation of Net Income received by Grantee during the preceding year. The Society shall have the right to audit the Grantee's books and records annually, in order to verify the Net Income derived annually from any Funded Invention.
  - iii. The percentage of Net Income due the Society from a Funded Invention shall be determined by the parties within 90 days of the date the Society is notified by the Grantee (to be extended by mutual agreement of both parties) pursuant to Section E above of the grant of a license, lease or other revenue generating agreement involving the Funded Invention.

If the parties are unable to agree on the percentage of Net Income payable to the Society or any amount owed to Grantee pursuant to Paragraph E above, the dispute (the "Dispute") shall be resolved as follows:

One of the parties shall request (the "Negotiation Request") that each of the parties appoint a designated executive management representative to meet for the purpose of endeavoring to resolve such Dispute. The designated executive representatives, who shall not have been directly involved in the initial negotiations, shall discuss the Dispute and negotiate in good faith in an effort to seek a resolution. During the course of such negotiation, all reasonable requests made by one party to the other for information will be honored so that each of the parties may be fully advised regarding the Dispute. If the designated executive representatives are unable to resolve the Dispute within 30 days after the Negotiation Request, the parties shall mediate the Dispute with a mutually acceptable mediator within the 30-day period beginning 31 days after the Negotiation Request. If the Dispute is not resolved by mediation within 60 days after the Negotiation Request, either party may initiate arbitration by delivering an arbitration demand to the other party (initiator of arbitration will travel to venue of other party), and the Dispute shall

be settled by arbitration in accordance with the Commercial Arbitration Rules of the American Arbitration Association ("AAA"), except that

- (a) there shall be one arbitrator mutually agreed upon by both parties within 30 days after initiation of arbitration and if the parties are unable to agree upon an arbitrator, the arbitrator shall be appointed by AAA;
- (b) neither party may submit more than 20 interrogatories, including subparts;
- (c) neither party shall be entitled to take more than two depositions and no deposition shall last more than two hours;
- (d) all discovery shall be concluded within 90 days of serving the arbitration demand;
- (e) each party shall bear its own costs and expenses and attorney's fees and an equal share of the arbitrator fees and any administrative fees of the arbitrator; and
- (f) arbitration shall not be utilized if Grantee is prohibited by law from submitting itself to binding arbitration.

The award of the arbitrator shall be binding, and judgment upon the award rendered by the arbitrator may be entered in any court having jurisdiction thereof.

**Please note that the American Cancer Society is unable to renegotiate the terms of this agreement with any individual institution.**

## **18. EXTENSION OF TERM OF GRANT/TRANSFERS/LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

A request for the extension of a grant term without additional funds must be submitted in writing to the Program Director 90 days before the expiration date of the grant. An extension of term request form can be found at <https://proposalcentral.altum.com>. Please include with the request an estimate of the funds to be carried over into the extension, and an explanation for the delay in completion of the specific aims – which aims remain incomplete and why. In general, a grant may be extended for up to one year if a programmatic need is justified and the funds to be carried over into the no-cost period do not exceed an amount equivalent to one year of support (direct plus indirect).

Requests for a leave of absence will be handled on a case-by-case basis. Please contact the Program Director at least 30 days prior to the proposed beginning of leave.

A grantee who plans to change institutions during the grant period must contact the Program Director to initiate the transfer request process.

Please note that up-to-date annual reports are required prior to approval of any grant modifications including transfers and no-cost extensions.

The Society reserves the right to deny requests for extensions, leaves of absence, or transfers.

## 19. CANCELLATION OF GRANT

If a grant is to be canceled prior to the original termination date, contact your Program Director and please fill out and submit the Request for Cancellation form which can be found at <https://proposalcentral.altum.com>.

The American Cancer Society may cancel a grant in its sole discretion if the institution fails to comply with all of the terms and obligations related to the grant. In the event a grant is canceled; the institution is only entitled to the prorated amount of the award accumulated between the start and termination dates. If the Postdoctoral Fellowship is cancelled prior to its end date, payments of the fellowship allowance will be prorated on a monthly basis. **The Society cannot assume responsibility for expenditures in excess of the prorated amount.**

Please note that if the award is to be canceled after initiation of the grant period, a final report will be due within 60 days of the termination date describing the work completed up to that point.

For Master's Training Grants in Clinical Oncology Social Work, Doctoral Training Grants in Oncology Social Work, Graduate Scholarships in Cancer Nursing Practice, and Doctoral Degree Scholarships in Cancer Nursing, withdrawal from the graduate program requires cancellation of the grant.

## 20. DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH GRANTS

An Institutional Research Grant (IRG) is a block award to an institution that enables it to give small grants to beginning investigators who have no national peer-reviewed research grant support. The intent is to support these junior faculty in initiating cancer research projects so they can obtain preliminary results that will enable them to compete successfully for national research grants. [See **REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLICANTS FOR IRG PILOT PROJECT GRANTS** (below) for additional information.]

The purpose of the Institutional Research Grants program is:

- to support the development of new investigators to conduct independent cancer research;
- to foster direct relationships between funded institutions and the local American Cancer Society; and
- to support research by newly independent investigators in areas of special interest to the Society.

Any nonprofit, non-government institution that has a significant number of established investigators conducting cancer research and a replenishing pool of junior faculty interested in cancer research may apply to receive an Institutional Research Grant. Since an IRG is awarded to an institution as a whole, funds should be available to support proposals from any health sciences school, college, and departments within the institution.

Because the intent of the IRG is to support the efforts of institutions to foster the early career development of cancer researchers, funding preference will be given to institutions that document a program of mentoring activities intended to accomplish this objective. Through the IRG, the Society also intends to promote collaboration across cancer research disciplines and among institutions. Several institutions within a city, state or other geographical region can form a

consortium to apply for an IRG, and such applications are strongly encouraged. It is also possible for institutions that have IRGs to partner with other, usually smaller biomedical research institutions in their region to form such a consortium. This also ensures access to the program by institutions that do not have a sufficiently large pool of beginning investigators on their own.

## **APPLICATION REVIEW**

New IRG applications are evaluated in terms of the potential impact on cancer research at an institution as judged by: (a) the description of the proposed procedures for implementing and administering an IRG program; (b) the size of the pool of applicants eligible for pilot project grants; (c) the number of faculty members active in cancer-related research; (d) the quality of the examples of research to be funded; and (e) the institution's need for IRG funding. The degree of interaction (current or proposed) between the institution and the local ACS is also a factor in the review.

Renewal applications are evaluated on the basis of the impact of the program, as evidenced by the productivity of the former grantees. **Overall research** accomplishments such as publications, awards, and national competitive grants, **especially those** obtained as a result of preliminary investigation supported by the IRG during the immediate past grant period(s). The application review also considers: (a) evidence of interaction between the institution, including the pilot project grant recipients, with the local Division or Unit of the American Cancer Society; (b) the effectiveness with which the local IRG committee administers the program; and (c) documented need of continued support. The relevance of the research supported by individual allocations to cancer is also an important factor in the evaluation of renewal requests for continued support. Note: prior critiques of successful renewal applications are provided to the reviewers; thus, response to the suggestions from the previous review is also a consideration in the evaluation of the application.

## **LOCAL INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The American Cancer Society believes that the established faculty at the institution is in the best position to determine who should be the individual recipients of the pilot project money awards. Accordingly, the institution, or group of institutions, must establish a local IRG Review Committee made up of representatives from the institution's schools and departments of medical, behavioral, biological, and physical sciences. The primary purpose of this Committee should be to receive and review applications from eligible junior faculty for support from the American Cancer Society IRG. The use of the Committee to allocate funds from other sources is not permitted.

The committee members, who should serve on a rotating basis, should include both senior and junior nationally funded faculty. The chair of the local IRG Committee, who will also serve as the principal investigator of the grant, should be, with rare exceptions, from the ranks of the senior faculty. Neither the principal investigator nor any members of the local IRG Committee may receive funds from the IRG. To foster communication about the IRG Program with volunteers and staff in the Society's Units and Divisions, institutions are expected to include one or two Division representatives as members of the local IRG Committee. (Please note: American Cancer Society staff may not vote on allocating funding to projects as this would constitute a conflict of interest.) In addition, the principal investigator should assume responsibility for contacting the appropriate American Cancer Society Region staff to develop the plan for ACS-institution interaction if none exists.



The following procedure for application review is recommended:

- (1) At least one call for applications and one formal meeting of the local IRG Committee should occur each year, more often for larger institutions/grants. There should be widespread promotion throughout the institution of the availability of funds for all qualified individuals (versus limiting such information to department heads).
- (2) Individual applicants submit written proposals for funding, preferably using the forms and biographical information sheets that the American Cancer Society provides with the application. The IRG Committee chair assigns each request to two or more committee members for review. Written evaluation of the projects should be supplied to the individual applicants after the funding decisions have been made.
- (3) Committee members rank applications using an NIH or ACS-type priority score. Members from the same department as the applicant should leave the room while the application is being discussed and must abstain from voting. The local IRG Committee sets a "payline" according to the quality of the science and the amount of money available. Note: only applications with high priority scores should receive pilot project grant funding. The chair is strongly encouraged to hold another review cycle and encourage applicants to revise and resubmit their proposals rather than fund non-competitive applications.
- (4) Following the meeting, the IRG Committee chair communicates the results of the review to all applicants. Awardees should be informed that publications resulting from research supported by the American Cancer Society **must** contain an acknowledgment, such as "Supported by Grant #IRG \_\_\_\_\_ from the American Cancer Society (See Instructions, Section 14, Summary Tables, for more information.)"

## **REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLICANTS FOR IRG PILOT PROJECT GRANTS**

IRG pilot project grants are intended to support independent, self-directed investigators early in their careers, for whom the institution must provide research facilities, resources or space customary for an independent investigator. These individuals (usually assistant professor or equivalent) must be eligible to apply for independent national competitive research grants, but may not currently hold such a grant. (At the discretion of the IRG principal investigator, an exception may be made for applicants with a non-cancer related grant.) Applicants for the pilot project grants should be within six years of their first independent research or faculty appointment. Support of senior investigators or postdoctoral fellows is not permitted.

Beginning in 2009, institutions may request a limited-time exception in order to allow faculty beyond the six-year eligibility limit but without six years of research experience to apply for IRG pilot project grants. Typically, these institutions will be those in the process of developing their cancer research programs and the capacity of their faculty to conduct cancer research. The pilot project grant applicants must meet all other eligibility criteria as stated above.

Recipients of IRG pilot project grants [are not required to be United States \(U.S.\) citizens. However, any applicant for IRG pilot project funding who is not a U.S. citizen must hold a visa that will allow](#)

him or her to remain in the U.S. long enough to complete the IRG pilot project. It is the responsibility of the institution to determine and document the visa status of any non-citizen recipient of IRG funds. Note: the American Cancer Society will not intercede on behalf of non-citizens whose stay in the U.S. may be limited by their visa status.

## **BASIS AND AMOUNT OF AWARD**

The total amount of money awarded to an institution is based on the size of the applicant pool, defined as the number of beginning investigators (usually assistant professor or equivalent) who are eligible to apply for independent national competitive research grants, but who do not currently hold such a grant. For estimating the amount of funds to be requested, it may be assumed that approximately 30% of the individual applications received for review by the local IRG Committee will be funded.

The amount of the maximum IRG pilot project grant allocation is \$30,000 for one year. This amount will be prorated for grants of less than one year. Institutions, at their own discretion, may supplement the award from other institutional funds, [but are discouraged from awarding less than the maximum amount from ACS funds.](#)

Effective with grants awarded in January 2007, an individual may apply for a one-year competitive renewal of a previously funded pilot project grant. The local IRG review committee should require and review a progress report as part of the consideration of the application for continuing funding.

## **SPECIAL INTEREST AWARDS**

An institution may include in its application a request for one additional pilot project grant per year to support research by junior faculty in areas of special interest to the Society. [These include “general” cancer control \(population sciences, psychosocial, behavioral, health policy, or health services research\), or research related to cancer health equity, childhood cancer, palliative care, and nutrition and physical activity and cancer.](#) The request must be specific to one of these areas and must be justified based on the institution’s programmatic goals and its suitability to support the program, ongoing research in the area, and potential applicant pool.

The merits of these special interest award applications should receive separate consideration by the local IRG Committee. Depending on the number of proposals received by the institution, the principal investigator may wish to appoint a subcommittee to review these applications, with one member of the subcommittee reporting to the full local IRG Review Committee.

The American Cancer Society National Peer Review Committee on Institutional Research Grants will review a request for a special interest module separately from the other portion of the application, and funds awarded for the module may not be used for any other purpose. Institutions that do not wish to apply for this special module may consider applications from junior faculty in these areas in the overall competition for individual IRG allocations.

## 21. TERM OF THE AWARD

New grants are awarded to institutions for a three-year period. Grants may be competitively renewed. Renewal awards may be from one to three years, depending on the merit of the application. The length of a funded renewal is determined by the National Peer Review Committee.

If an institution is submitting an application to renew a grant whose funding has lapsed, an explanation for the lapse in the program is needed along with as much documentation as possible of prior pilot project funding. If the grant was inactive for six or more years, it will be considered a new application.

**Extension Without Additional Funds.** If an institution's renewal application is not successful, then and only then can an extension in time be granted. This extension may be for up to one year without additional funds, upon written request from the principal investigator. The request must be received thirty days before the expiration date of the grant. (See also Section 18.)

## 22. ALLOCATION AND EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS

Funds must be allocated by the local IRG Committee before the expiration date indicated in the award letter. Individuals have one year from the time of receipt of their pilot project grants to spend their allocations, **even if this extends past the end date of the entire IRG.** An institution can decide internally to extend the term of an individual pilot project grant so that funds can continue to be available to complete the project. Once the award is made to the individual grantee, the Society generally considers the funds expended. However, if unspent funds for an individual pilot project award occur, they must be either competitively reallocated by the institutional IRG committee to another project grant, or, if this is not possible, returned to the ACS at the time of grant termination and submission of the Final Report of Expenditures. (Examples of a need to reallocate awarded funds include premature award termination due to departure of the funded investigator, or, early termination of the project for scientific reasons or successful NIH funding.)

An institution cannot have more than one IRG in effect at any one time. If the entire IRG award made to an institution is not spent within the normal term of a grant, the unallocated funds cannot be carried forward to a renewal IRG or to any other grant. (However, funds may be carried forward to subsequent years of the same IRG. Thus, the number of pilot projects awarded in each year of a grant is at the discretion of the local IRG Committee.)

### EXPENDITURES ALLOWED

- Research supplies and animal maintenance
- Technical assistance
- Domestic travel when necessary to carry out the proposed research program
- Publication costs, including reprints
- Costs of computer time
- Special fees (pathology, photography, etc.)
- Stipends for graduate students and postdoctoral assistants if their role is to promote and sustain the project presented by the junior faculty member

- Equipment costing less than \$2,000. (Special justification is necessary for items exceeding this amount)
- Registration fees at scientific meetings

## **EXPENDITURES NOT ALLOWED**

*The disallowed items below are in addition to those listed earlier in **INSTITUTIONAL***

### ***EXPENDITURES.***

- Salary of principal investigator (IRG Chair or pilot project grant recipient)
- Honoraria and travel expenses for visiting lecturers

## **23. INDIRECT COSTS**

American Cancer Society grants are not designed to cover the total cost of an IRG Program. The institution is expected to provide the required physical facilities and administrative services. So that more money will be available to the junior investigator, indirect costs are not allowed for Institutional Research Grants.

## **24. CHANGE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR**

The American Cancer Society must authorize any request for a change of principal investigator. Such a request must be submitted in writing and signed by an authorized official of the institution. To access the necessary form for change in principal investigator, please go to <https://proposalcentral.altum.com>. (submission instructions are in appendix). Biographical information for the new principal investigator must be sent to the Program Director for Institutional Research Grants before the request can be approved.

## **25. REQUIRED PROGRESS REPORTS**

As soon as possible following the award of pilot projects in each year of the grant, but no later than December 31, the principal investigator must submit a report of the annual IRG project allocations. This report shall consist of the following:

- The overall funding percentage for the year, i.e., awarded applications as a per cent of total applications reviewed.
- The name of each awardee with degree(s), the title of the project, term and amount awarded.
- A copy of the project abstract submitted with the IRG pilot project application.

To access the necessary form for annual progress reports, please go to <https://proposalcentral.altum.com>. (submission instructions are in the appendix). This information will be added to the database record for your grant and provided to the local ACS office to facilitate understanding of the program and interaction with the recipients. *Submission of this information early in each grant year is strongly encouraged.*

## **26. REQUIRED FINANCIAL REPORTS**

For the Society's purposes, funds are considered expended once they have been allocated from the IRG to the individual investigator who then has a full year in which to spend the monies allocated. Since many allocations are not made until late in the award year, the final report of expenditures is not due until 15 months after the expiration date stated in the award letter. For example, if an IRG was in effect from January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018, the report of expenditures will be due on March 31, 2020. See “Frequently Asked Questions” for additional information about the IRG terms and financial reporting. To access the necessary form for a final report of expenditures, please go to <https://proposalcentral.altum.com>. Submission instructions are provided in the Appendix to these Policies.

## APPENDIX A: ANSWERS TO FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

### QUESTIONS ABOUT PILOT PROJECT GRANTS

- Q: I am a new assistant professor without any grant support from a national agency. Can I apply to the American Cancer Society National Office for an IRG?
- A: NO! Only the institution may apply. If there is an IRG in effect at your institution, you may apply to the local IRG Committee for support. If you don't know whether your institution holds an American Cancer Society IRG, contact the Society's Extramural Grants Department at 404-329-7558 or [grants@cancer.org](mailto:grants@cancer.org).
- Q: I am an assistant professor, and my initial nationally peer reviewed research grant was not renewed. Can I apply to my institution for an IRG?
- A: Yes. Individuals whose initial grant was not renewed and who are still at the level of assistant professor may apply for an individual IRG--provided they are within the first six years of their independent faculty (or equivalent) appointment and have not received funds from the IRG before.
- Q: What about personnel grants that are primarily intended for the junior investigator's salary, such as the NIH K series?
- A: As long as the applicant meets all other criteria, holders of personnel awards are eligible to receive pilot project money from the IRG. [However, this does not apply to investigators with the K99/R00. These individuals already are receiving funding to help support an application for an independent research grant. Thus, an IRG pilot project grant would be more beneficial if awarded to an applicant who has no external support.](#)
- Q: I have a small grant from a local foundation. Am I eligible for an individual IRG award?
- A: As long as the grant is not the result of a national peer-reviewed competition and is for support of a different project, you may still apply for an IRG award.
- Q: I am an assistant professor with an RO1 award, but want to initiate a project in a totally different area. May I apply for an individual IRG Award?
- A: No. The IRG is intended for new investigators without an active (i.e., NIH, NSF, ACS) national competitive research grant, no matter what the topic.
- Q: Is an individual eligible for more than one pilot project grant?
- A: An individual grantee may receive a second year of funding for the same pilot project only. The award is contingent upon the local IRG committee's review and approval of a progress report. An individual may NOT receive a second grant to initiate a different pilot project.

### QUESTIONS ABOUT THE LOCAL IRG REVIEW COMMITTEE

- Q: Who is on the local IRG Review Committee?
- A: The local IRG Review Committee should be composed of representatives from all the health science schools and colleges of the institution. The chair of the Committee is the principal investigator of the IRG.

- Q: How many people should serve on the local IRG Review Committee?  
A: That depends on the number of applications to be reviewed and the expertise required. A broad representation from departments with investigators doing cancer research should be included.
- Q: Should the Committee be composed only of senior researchers?  
A: Preferably not, although the principal investigator of the IRG is usually a senior investigator. Junior researchers who are not eligible to receive pilot project grants from the IRG because they have funding from a national agency are also recommended. Ideally, former IRG recipients will also become Committee members.
- Q: How long should a Committee member serve?  
A: We suggest that committee members serve four or five year staggered terms, similar to our National peer review committees.
- Q: The INSTRUCTIONS state that the local IRG Review Committee should include representatives from the local American Cancer Society. Why is this?  
A: The Society wishes to increase awareness among our volunteers and staff about the importance of our Research Program. It is only because of the hard work of the volunteers in soliciting contributions that we are able to award money for research. When staff or volunteers serve on the local IRG Review Committee, they develop identification with both research and researchers and their understanding of and enthusiasm for research increases. This interaction is a very important criterion for judging the success of renewal applications.
- Q: How do we identify these ACS representatives?  
A: If you do not know your contact in the local American Cancer Society office, the IRG Program Director, Virginia Krawiec, can obtain the name of a contact for you.
- Q: Can you give some other examples of successful Division-institution interactions?  
A:
  - 1) Hosting an event for the local ACS staff and volunteers where they can meet and hear presentations from the individual IRG awardees or other ACS grantees.
  - 2) Arranging visits of groups of ACS volunteers and staff to the institution to see the labs and investigators on an informal basis.
  - 3) Collaborating on advocacy efforts through the ACS Cancer Action Network.
  - 4) Collaborate on cancer control initiatives such as “80% by 2018” (**National Colorectal Cancer Roundtable initiative to increase colorectal cancer screening**)

On their part, local ACS staff can:

- 1) Invite individual grantees and/or the principal investigator of the IRG to present research updates at local ACS events such as Relay for Life, major donor receptions or Board of Directors meetings; present certificates to recipients of the pilot project grants.
- 2) Participate in the local IRG Review Committee when asked to do so by the institution.
- 3) Engage ACS grantees in ACS CAN advocacy efforts or other ACS initiatives.

## **QUESTIONS ABOUT COMMITTEE OPERATIONS**

- Q: How does the pilot project grant review process occur?  
A: The timing and operations of the review process are determined by the institution, but should follow the guidelines in the **POLICIES**.
- Q: What is a good way to publicize the availability of funds?  
A: Campus-wide publicity via E-mail or letters to all eligible junior faculty, not just to department chairs, is the best way. Notices on bulletin boards and in campus newsletters also work well. One institution put posters and a box of individual application forms at the entrances of all science buildings and received a record number of applications.
- Q: What should we do if the recipient of a pilot project grant receives a national competitive grant on the same topic before any of the IRG award is spent?  
A: If the Institutional Research Grant is still in effect, the unspent funds may be awarded to the next approved applicant; otherwise, the money must be returned to the Society.

## **QUESTIONS ABOUT THE FORMAT OF THE APPLICATION**

- Q: Why is so much documentation required?  
A: The present forms were designed with the advice of the members of the National Peer Review Committee for Institutional Research Grants. The Tables present the relevant information in a clear and consistent fashion, facilitating the evaluation process and enabling comparison of institutions with very diverse characteristics.
- Q: How do we determine the number of junior investigators doing cancer research at our institution?  
A: One way is to survey department chairs for the number of newly hired faculty and the number of recruitments planned for the next three years. Another approach is to request letters of intent from all prospective beginning investigators in the institution to assess their numbers and level of interest in applying for a pilot project grant.
- Q: We have no idea what has happened to our awardees from previous years. What do we do?  
A: The requirement for a five-year track record has been in effect since 1989, so five years of documentation should be available for inclusion in all renewal applications. The track record of awardees in obtaining publications and grants is the most important criterion on which renewals are evaluated.

## **QUESTIONS ABOUT THE TERMS AND BUDGET**

- Q: Please explain the American Cancer Society policy on indirect costs for IRGs.  
A: The Society wants as much money as possible to be used for the beginning investigators' projects. At the December 1993 meeting, the Board of Directors voted to eliminate indirect costs for the IRGs, beginning with new and renewal grants initiated on or after July 1, 1994.
- Q: How does an institution's business office handle IRG accounts?  
A: The institution must set up a separate, master account for the grant to the institution. Most institutions then create subaccounts for each individual pilot project grant. The term of the



pilot project grant is usually for one year following the notification date to the individual, not from the start date of the institution's IRG. The master account will be empty when all the pilot project grants have been made. Individuals with pilot project grant have one year from the time of receipt of their award to spend their allocations, **even if this extends past the end date of the entire IRG.**

Q: What about awards made to other institutions as part of a consortium agreement?

A: These can usually be handled as subcontracts to the other institution.

Q: Our institution didn't award all of its pilot project grants until April, and the IRG grant year terminates December 31. Can the individual investigators spend their funds after December 31 without violating the Society's policy of not allowing carryover of unexpended funds from one grant period to the next?

A: Yes. Because of the special nature of the IRGs, the Society considers the funds to have been expended once they have been allocated to, but not necessarily spent by, an individual investigator. Therefore, it is important to award all of the pilot project grants by December 31 of the final year of the grant. As an example, IRG-16-003-01 is in effect from January 1, 2016, through December 31, 2018. Individuals receiving pilot project grants in September 2018 will have until August 2019 to spend their money, and a final report of expenditures for grant IRG-16-003-01 will not be due until March 31, 2020.

Q: May unspent funds be carried over from an existing IRG to a new grant?

A: No, if the institution has received a renewal, IRG-16-111-04, any money from IRG-13-003-01 not allocated as pilot project grants by December 31, 2018, must be returned to the Society and cannot be applied to allocations made after that date. All allocations made from January 1, 2019, through the end of the grant, must come from the IRG-13-003-01 award. If the institution's renewal application is not successful, then, and only then, can an extension in time be granted, if so requested by the institution.

Q: One of our individual grantees received a pilot project grant in November, before the grant year ended that December 31. He has had a hard time getting started and has money left over after a year. Can we extend him for an additional year?

A: That is up to the local IRG review committee. Once the pilot project grant was awarded to the individual, the Society considers the funds expended. The committee can decide internally to extend the term of the individual's pilot project grant, or to return the leftover funds to the Society. Since the report of expenditures on an IRG ending December 31, 2018, will be due March 2020, it might be necessary for the principal investigator of the IRG in this example to request a delay in filing the report of expenditures.

Q: One of our awardees from a previous IRG has left the institution and has money remaining in her account. Can we apply that money to one of the new pilot project grant applicants?

A: Only if the parent IRG is still in effect. Otherwise, that money must be returned to the Society.

- Q: I am an IRG pilot project grant recipient with a graduate student working in my lab. Can I use part of my \$30,000 allocation to pay this student's tuition or stipend?
- A: Stipend, yes; direct payment of tuition is not an allowable expense.

### QUESTIONS ON SPECIAL INTEREST AWARDS

- Q: What is a Special Interest Award and how does the National Peer Review Committee decide who gets one?
- A: A Special Interest Award is a \$30,000 pilot project grant targeted for a project in the area of overall cancer control, such as population science or behavioral research or one of the following specific areas of special interest to the Society: cancer health equity, childhood cancer, palliative care, and nutrition and physical activity and cancer. Since applications in these areas may not compete well for limited funds, an institution may request up to \$30,000 to be allocated for a project in one of these areas in addition to the funds requested for other research projects. If the National peer review committee believes that the institution has a good environment for and a sufficient number of applicants in the special interest area, it will recommend approval of the request for a Special Interest Award. This portion of the award cannot be used for any other purpose. If no suitable applicant is found, the money must be returned to the Society and may not be used to support projects in other disciplines.
- Q: Our institution was not recommended for a Special Interest Award. Does that mean we cannot accept applications in those areas?
- A: You may review applications in those areas in competition with applications in all other areas.
- Q: How does the local IRG Committee review the applications for a Special Interest Award?
- A: Some institutions set up a separate subcommittee to review applications in the special interest area. The subcommittee is chaired by a voting member of the local IRG Committee, who presents the recommendations of the subcommittee to the full group.

### MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

- Q: What are the most common reasons for the disapproval of an IRG application?
- A: For new applications, the most common reasons for disapproval or failure to make the cutoff are (1) an apparent bias in the composition of the local IRG Committee and the procedure for the allocation of funds toward one school or department, (2) failure to document an adequate pool size of junior investigators, or (3) insufficient ongoing cancer research at the institution.

For renewals, the most common reasons are (1) lack of productivity of past awardees, (2) [inaccuracy of and](#) inconsistency between application tables, (3) insufficient interaction with the local Division of the American Cancer Society, and (4) giving pilot project grants to inappropriate individuals (i.e., fellows or other non-independent investigators, senior investigators, investigators with national grants, etc.).

## **APPENDIX B: GUIDELINES FOR MAINTAINING RESEARCH AND PEER REVIEW INTEGRITY**

The American Cancer Society seeks excellence in the discovery and dissemination of knowledge regarding the cause, prevention, detection and diagnosis, treatment, survivorship and health policy of cancer. This requires that all individuals affiliated with, or funded by, the American Cancer Society adhere to the highest standards of professional integrity. Volunteer grant reviewers for the American Cancer Society will also be held to the highest codes of conduct and integrity in performing their essential function of peer review.

The American Cancer Society provides grant funds for individuals at academic and other not-for-profit institutions to promote cancer-related training, research and treatment. This represents a contractual relationship with such institutions, and it is an accepted responsibility and obligation of those institutions to provide policies and procedures for their faculty, staff and students that address possible misconduct in training, research and treatment of patients. Moreover, it is the responsibility and obligation of faculty, students and staff engaged in scientific research and training to be aware of policies and procedures for addressing possible misconduct at their institutions, and to follow those procedures in reporting possible misconduct.

While questions of the integrity of applicants, grantees, and reviewers are very infrequent, they do occur. It is the responsibility of the Program Directors managing the review process and portfolios of funded grants and the responsibility of the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research to ensure that all questions regarding research integrity are handled in a discrete, but thorough manner. The actions of the Program Directors and the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research must ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of the individual raising the question of misconduct; ensure the integrity of the American Cancer Society and its review processes; ensure the rights of the individual accused of misconduct; and ensure their own credibility and integrity.

### **Article I**

#### **Standards and Definitions:**

##### **1.1 Research Misconduct by Applicants or Grantees**

The American Cancer Society uses the following definitions related to scientific misconduct outlined in the Federal Guidelines [Federal Register, Vol. 65, No. 235, ppg. 76260-76264].

- Research misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.<sup>1</sup>
- Research, as used herein, includes all basic, applied, and demonstration research in all fields of science, engineering, and mathematics. This includes, but is not limited to, research in economics, education, linguistics, medicine, biology, chemistry, psychology, natural sciences, social sciences, statistics, and research involving human subjects or animals.<sup>1</sup>
- Fabrication is defined as making up data or results and recording or reporting them.<sup>1</sup>

- Falsification is defined as manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.<sup>1</sup>
- The research record is defined as the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry, and includes, but is not limited to, research proposals, laboratory records, both physical and electronic, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, and journal articles.<sup>1</sup>
- Plagiarism is defined as the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.
- Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.<sup>1</sup>
- Reported Qualifications must be accurate (e.g. years since degree earned).

## **1.2 Research Misconduct by Peer Review Committee Members**

The American Cancer Society has adopted the following definitions of misconduct in review by members of a Peer Review Committee. Misconduct in review is defined as:

- Review for an application for which there is a clear conflict of interest between the reviewer and applicant. What is considered a COI – a recent publication, grant collaboration, trained together
- Failure to notify ACS personnel of actual, potential perceived or potentially perceived conflicts of interest.
- Any communication pertaining to review related materials between a member[s] of a peer review committee and an applicant, or the mentor of an applicant, in the case of applications with an element of training as part of the application.
- Any communication of the unpublished content of a grant application by a member or members of a peer review committee with any individual who is not a permanent or ad hoc member of the peer review committee to which an application is assigned, or who has not been approved by the Program Director for such communication.
- Any use of the unpublished content or concepts of a grant application in pursuit of scientific or career goals by a member of a peer review committee.
- Any review of, or use of, the contents of a grant application by a member or members of a peer review committee who might have, or be perceived to have, a conflict of interest with the applicant or his/her mentor, in the case of applications with an element of training as part of the application

## **1.3 Confidentiality Standard for Reviewers**

To preserve the integrity of the peer review process, all parties involved in the review process must adhere to the following practices regarding confidentiality and non-disclosure:

---

<sup>1</sup> The above definitions are outlined in the Federal Guidelines [Federal Register, Vol.65, No.235, ppg: 76260-76264]

- Reviewers must not discuss applications reviewed with any individual not designated as a part of the review process; and especially not with applicants, or their mentors in the case of training grants, either before or after the peer review meetings.
- Any inquiries to a peer review panel member regarding an application from an applicant, PI, Co-PIs, consultants or their mentor, to a member of a Peer Review Committee or ACS Council for Extramural Grants must be reported immediately to the Program Director.
- All materials related to the review process must be destroyed or given to the Program Coordinator at the end of the review meeting.
- For purposes of this standard, materials related to the review process include, but are not limited to: paper, bound volumes, compact disks (CDs), flashdrives, electronic files accessed via the internet, or oral presentations or discussions.

#### **1.4 Conflict of Interest Standard for Reviewers**

To preserve the integrity of the peer review process, all participants in the process must adhere to these principles and practices:

- Reviewers must not be an employer or employee of an applicant, and may not be employed by the same institution as an applicant within three years of the date of submission of an application
- Reviewers must not be a party to any agreement for future employment or other agreements or arrangements with an applicant or any person listed as key personnel on an application
- Reviewers must not have served as mentors or collaborators of an applicant within 3 years of the date of an application
- Reviewers must not participate in the review of an application submitted by a standing member of a Peer Review Committee serving on the same review committee, with the exception of Health Professional Training Grants or Institutional Research Grants
- Reviewers must not be under the health care of, or providing health care to, an applicant or any person listed as key personnel on an application
- Reviewers must not have received or have the potential to receive direct financial benefit from the application
- Reviewers must not be pursuing research projects which might be viewed as being in direct competition with applicants or their collaborators and colleagues; nor have potential to receive direct benefit from failure of the application to be funded
  - Reviewers must not have any cause of action against, any dispute with, any long-standing scientific or personal differences with, or any claim whatsoever against the applicant or any person listed as key personnel on an application

## **Article II**

### **Policies:**

#### **2.1 Policy Governing Misconduct by Applicants and Grantees**

##### **2.1.1 Applicants:**

Any allegations of scientific misconduct must be brought to the immediate attention of the Program Director in charge of the Peer Review Committee which is responsible for reviewing the work in question. If possible, allegations of misconduct on the part of an applicant in the submission of a grant proposal should be raised in advance of the review meeting. The Program Director will then bring the allegation to the attention of the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research at ACS. The Senior Vice President for Extramural Research will evaluate the allegation and make a determination on the misconduct issue and the appropriate next steps to be taken engage in further investigation or action in accordance with Article III “Procedures for Handling Conflicts of Interest and Allegations or Findings of Misconduct in Research and Peer Review”.

### 2.1.2 Grantees:

In instances where alleged scientific misconduct occurs after the awarding of a grant, such as in the publication of falsified data, the Program Director will bring the allegation to the attention of the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research at ACS. The Senior Vice President for Extramural Research will evaluate the allegation and make a determination of the appropriate steps to be taken to engage in further investigation or action as defined in Article III, “Procedures for Handling Conflicts of Interest and Allegations or Findings of Misconduct in Research and Peer Review”.

## **2.2 Policy Governing Misconduct by Peer Review Committee Members**

### 2.2.1 Confidentiality:

Confidentiality is at the heart of the peer review process and is imperative for objective evaluation and free expression in the review process. The applicant-reviewer relationship is a privileged alliance founded on the ethical rule of confidentiality.<sup>2</sup> To maintain the essence and integrity of the peer review process, the Society and its appointed peer reviewers must ensure and be assured that the confidentiality of the applicant’s information, the contents of the grant application, and of the proceedings of the review panel will be maintained. Such confidentiality adheres when a person discloses information to another with the understanding that the information will not be divulged to others without the discloser’s consent, or as otherwise required by law. In the context of peer review, this rule upholds the applicants’ rights to have the information they submit, whether in proposal form or in communications, kept confidential. The rule also ensures that those involved in the review process maintain their obligation to keep confidential any information concerning an application. In fact, the very existence of a submission should not be revealed (or confirmed) to anyone other than those within the review process unless and until the application is funded.

To this end, all contents, evaluation and discussion of applications shall be confined to Peer Review Committee (PRC) members and ACS staff personnel (Program Director, Senior Vice President for Extramural Research, Program Coordinator, support staff) responsible for managing the review process of that PRC. For these purposes, reviewers include all standing and ad hoc reviewers of PRCs and members of the Council for Extramural Grants. In rare and specific instances, discussion of applications with, or in the presence of, non-committee

members can occur after obtaining the written consent of the Program Director. Reviewers must not discuss reviews with applicants or their mentors in the case of training grants, either before or after the review meetings. Reviewers also must not communicate the contents of any grant applications with individuals not associated with the review process. Any materials related to the review process must be disposed of at the meeting, and all final critiques given to the Program Director for inclusion in summary statements.

If an allegation of a breach of reviewer confidentiality is brought forward, that allegation will be communicated to the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research who will determine if an investigation of that allegation is warranted. The Senior Vice President for Extramural Research will then follow the appropriate steps as defined in Article III, “Procedures for Handling Conflicts of Interest and Allegations or Findings of Misconduct in Research and Peer Review”.

### 2.2.2 Conflict of Interest:

An objective evaluation of grant proposals is essential to the peer review process. In achieving this goal, there must be no conflict of interest, apparent conflict of interest or pending future conflict of interest between any participant in the review process and the applicants or their collaborators and colleagues. In this setting, reviewers include standing and ad hoc Peer Review Committee (PRC) members and members of the ACS Council for Extramural Grants responsible for, and participating in, the review process. There are numerous bases for conflicts of interest, and these can include: employment, professional relationships, personal relationships, financial benefit, industry affiliation or other interests. The conflicts can be real or apparent. For Definitions of Conflict of Interest, refer to Section 1.4.

Reviewers may not make use of any of the contents of a grant for their own research purposes or those of their collaborators and colleagues. Reviewers must exercise proper due diligence in investigating and disclosing any potential conflict of interest that might exist between themselves and an applicant or the applicant’s collaborators or mentors. The Conflict of Interest Statement attached as EXHIBIT A shall be submitted to the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research for review at least sixty (60) days prior to the beginning of the Peer Review cycle.

If an allegation of a reviewer conflict of interest is brought forward, that allegation will be communicated to the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research who will determine if an investigation of that allegation is warranted. The Senior Vice President for Extramural Research will then follow the appropriate steps as defined in Article III “Procedures for Handling Conflicts of Interest and Allegations or Findings of Misconduct”.

## Article III

### **Procedures for Handling Conflicts of Interest and Allegations or Findings of Misconduct:**

To ensure the integrity of the peer review process and the integrity of ACS-sponsored research, it is necessary that the procedures for dealing with allegations of misconduct be clearly understood by all reviewers and ACS personnel. Procedures for handling allegations of misconduct by applicants, grantees and reviewers are detailed in the following sections.

### 3.1 Procedures for Handling an Allegation of Scientific Misconduct by Applicants or Grantees

#### 3.1.1 Misconduct by Applicants:

In the event that an allegation of scientific misconduct by an applicant is brought forward to a Program Director or other ACS staff, all effort must be made to investigate the validity of the allegation while maintaining the confidentiality of the individual making the allegation, the anonymity of the person against whom the allegation is made, and the integrity of the review process. The Program Director must immediately inform the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research of the allegation, and provide all relevant information regarding the allegation. It is the Vice President's responsibility to evaluate the likelihood of scientific misconduct; and, if warranted, it is the Vice President's responsibility to contact the appropriate institutional office at the applicant's institution regarding the allegation. The Senior Vice President for Extramural Research will then serve as the point of contact between the ACS and the institutional official[s] handling issues of scientific misconduct.

If determined to be appropriate, the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research will forward an allegation of misconduct and all pertinent information to the Research Integrity Officer at the institution sponsoring the grant application in question or at which the alleged misconduct was carried out. If there is not a Research Integrity Officer, the Dean of the School in question or its chief academic officer will be contacted. In the instance that the person[s] making the allegation does not contact the American Cancer Society but raises the allegation of misconduct with the appropriate institutional official according to their established institutional procedures, it is the responsibility of the institution to contact the American Cancer Society regarding the allegation, any investigation of the allegation, and the outcome of that investigation. All such correspondence will be held in strict confidence, and will not be made public by the American Cancer Society irrespective of the outcome of the investigation. The American Cancer Society assumes no responsibility in carrying out the investigation of scientific misconduct, or in determining an individual's innocence or guilt of the allegation of misconduct. However, acceptance or non-acceptance of the findings of the institutional investigation is at the discretion of the Senior Vice President, and additional clarification may be requested.

Allegations of scientific misconduct in a grant application may be made by individuals who are colleagues, trainees, or reviewers. In the instance that an allegation of misconduct is made in reference to a grant application, the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research will contact the institutional official at the sponsoring research institution and seek to follow their established protocol for investigating such allegations. If an investigation is deemed necessary, it will be the responsibility of the sponsoring institution to carry out the investigation, to keep the ACS aware of the progress, and to report the outcome of the investigation to the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research.

In fairness to the applicant, the review process must continue while the allegation of misconduct undergoes assessment. Review may continue either in the standing review committee or under the By-pass to Council review mechanism. *Under no circumstance* should a reviewer, Program Director or ACS staff raise the issue of the allegation in a peer review meeting or meeting of



ACS Council for Extramural Grants. If that were to occur, review of that application could not be completed without bias; and review of the application must therefore be deferred to ad hoc reviewers or the ACS Council for Extramural Grants. If a reviewer suspects misconduct, which is discovered at the time of the meeting, it is appropriate to request the Chair of the PRC or Council take a "break" and discuss the issue privately with the Program Director. The Program Director will then take the proscribed administrative steps following the adjournment of the review meeting.

The ACS will complete the process of peer review of the application, but will suspend any administrative action which would result in funding of the award in question until the resolution of the investigation. At the conclusion of the investigation, the ACS will require the Office of Research Integrity or comparable entity at the applicant's sponsoring institution to provide a written statement detailing the results of the investigation. Failure of the institution to carry out such an investigation in a timely manner or to provide written results of the investigation will result in the administrative disapproval of the application. If the applicant is absolved of any scientific misconduct, the ACS will reinstitute administrative action that can result in funding for the award if it was approved and is within the pay-line established by ACS Council for Extramural Grants. In the instance that misconduct has occurred, the ACS will administratively inactive the application. Also, in the case of a finding of scientific misconduct, the investigator may no longer be eligible to participate in ACS funded awards, either as principal investigator, co-investigator, collaborator, mentor or consultant. The investigator also may not be eligible to serve in any capacity in reviewing ACS grant proposals.

### 3.1.2 Misconduct by Grantees:

In the event that an allegation of scientific misconduct by a grantee is brought forward to a Program Director or other ACS staff, all effort must be made to investigate the validity of the allegation while maintaining the confidentiality of the individual making the allegation and the anonymity of the person against whom the allegation is made. The Program Director or ACS staff contacted about the alleged misconduct must immediately inform the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research of the allegation, and provide all relevant information regarding the allegation. It is the Vice President's responsibility to evaluate the likelihood of scientific misconduct; and, if warranted, it is the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research's responsibility to contact the appropriate institutional office at the applicant's institution regarding the allegation. The Senior Vice President for Extramural Research will then serve as the point of contact between the ACS and the institutional official[s] handling issues of scientific misconduct.

If determined to be appropriate, the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research will forward an allegation of misconduct and all pertinent information to the Research Integrity Officer at the institution sponsoring the grant in question or at which the alleged misconduct was carried out. If there is not a Research Integrity Officer, the Dean of the School in question or its chief academic officer will be contacted. In the instance that the person[s] making the allegation does not contact the American Cancer Society but raises the allegation of misconduct with the appropriate institutional official according to their established institutional procedures, it is the responsibility of the institution to contact the American Cancer Society regarding the allegation, any

investigation of the allegation, and the outcome of that investigation. All such correspondence will be held in strict confidence, and will not be made public by the American Cancer Society irrespective of the outcome of the investigation. The American Cancer Society assumes no responsibility in carrying out the investigation of scientific misconduct, or in determining an individual's innocence or guilt of the allegation of misconduct. However, failure of the institution to carry out such an investigation in a timely manner or to provide written results of the investigation may result in the suspension of ACS funds for all grants awarded at the institution. The American Cancer Society assumes no responsibility in carrying out the investigation of scientific misconduct, or in determining an individual's innocence or guilt of the allegation of misconduct. However, acceptance or non-acceptance of the findings of the institutional investigation is at the discretion of the Senior Vice President, and additional clarification may be requested.

If the investigator has an active ACS award, funding of that award will be suspended until the allegation has either been confirmed or be proven to be erroneous. If the allegation is proven not to have merit, the award will be reinstated at the date of notification of those findings by the sponsoring institution. If the allegation of misconduct is confirmed, the award will be terminated and any residual funds, as of the date of notification of the sponsoring institution of the allegation, must be returned to the ACS. In the case of a finding of scientific misconduct, the investigator may no longer be eligible to participate in ACS funded awards, either as principal investigator, co-investigator, collaborator, mentor, or consultant. The investigator may also not be eligible to serve in any capacity in reviewing ACS grant proposals.

The publication of data serves to further the interests of the scientific pursuit, and specifically in the case of the ACS, the pursuit of eliminating the burden of cancer. Therefore, it is incumbent on both the ACS and the scientific community to insure that any instances of misrepresentation of findings in a scientific study are apparent to the scientific community. To that end, a finding of falsification or misrepresentation of data in a published forum must be reported to the editor-in-chief of the journal in which such data is reported. It is the responsibility of the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research to coordinate such notification with the appropriate sponsoring institutional official according to their established policies and in conjunction with the policies of the journal. If the sponsoring institution does not have a policy regarding notification of the journal, then the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research will notify the editor-in-chief of the journal according to the journal's established policies.

In the case of findings of falsification or misrepresentation of published data supported by ACS funds, any active grant[s] held by the responsible individual will be terminated and that individual may no longer be eligible for ACS funding via any mechanism as a principal investigator, co-investigator, collaborator, mentor, or consultant. That individual may also not be eligible to participate in ACS review in any capacity.

### 3.1.3 Reviewer Misconduct and Conflict of Interest

In the event that an allegation of reviewer misconduct, such as failure to acknowledge a conflict of interest, is brought forward to a Program Director or other ACS staff, all effort must be made to investigate the validity of the allegation while maintaining the confidentiality of the individual

making the allegation, the anonymity of the person against whom the allegation is made, and the integrity of the review process. The Program Director or other ACS staff contacted regarding the alleged misconduct must immediately inform the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research of the allegation, and provide all relevant information regarding the allegation. It is the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research's responsibility to evaluate the likelihood of reviewer conflict of interest or misconduct; and, if warranted, it is the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research's responsibility to handle the investigation internally or to inform the appropriate institutional office at the reviewer's institution about the allegation if aspects of the reviewer misconduct violate any of the tenets of professional behavior established by that institution. The Senior Vice President for Extramural Research will then serve as the point of contact between the ACS and the institutional official handling issues of reviewer misconduct.

Some elements of reviewer misconduct represent conduct that will only have relevance for the appropriateness of the reviewer's role as a member of a peer review committee. For instance, if there is inappropriate communication between reviewer and applicant or an applicant's mentor or colleagues. In a case of this type, all elements of the investigation of the reviewer misconduct will be handled by ACS personnel at the discretion of the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research. In cases where a reviewer does not retain the confidentiality of the applicant's information or the content of his or her application, and makes that information available to a third party, it will be at the discretion of the Senior Vice President for Extramural Research to handle the issue internally at ACS or contact the Office of Research Integrity at the reviewer's institution, based upon an initial assessment of whether such conduct violates the rules of conduct established by that institution. For instance, if there is communication of the contents of a grant proposal by a reviewer to a competitor in the same field as the applicant, or if the reviewer makes use of findings or ideas in an application to further his or her own research interests. In the instance of such an allegation, the American Cancer Society assumes no responsibility for carrying out the investigation of scientific misconduct, or in determining an individual's innocence or guilt of the allegation of misconduct. It is the institution's responsibility to handle the misconduct according to their established procedures. However, acceptance or non-acceptance of the findings of the institutional investigation is at the discretion of the Senior Vice President, and additional clarification may be requested. In any instance of a finding of reviewer misconduct, that individual may no longer be eligible to serve in any capacity in reviewing ACS grant proposals, and may be barred from receiving any ACS grant funds.

---

<sup>2</sup>This section is adapted from "Confidentiality in Peer Review" (section 3.7.1). Pugh MB, ed. American Medical Association Manual of Style: a guide for authors and editors. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Baltimore, MD: Williams & Wilkins; 1997:136-137; and from the American Cancer Society Confidentiality, Non-Disclosure Rules and Conflict of Interest: Information for Reviewers of Grant Applications, Version 6/3/2005

## APPENDIX C: INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING DELIVERABLES:

**GRANT ACTIVATION FORM  
ANNUAL PROGRESS/FINAL REPORT  
TRANSFER REQUEST  
CHANGE OF INSTITUTION REQUEST  
CHANGE OF TERM REQUEST  
EXTENSION OF TERM REQUEST  
GRANT CANCELLATION  
CHANGE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR REQUEST  
REPORT OF EXPENDITURES**

The American Cancer Society subscribes to the **Post Award Management System** provided by Altum proposalCENTRAL. The system is designed to collect grant post award information from grantees. Grantees are asked to keep their proposalCENTRAL profile current for the duration of the grant.

The site is used to upload all requests for grant changes and related documents, and required reports (deliverables). The site will house all reports, requests and correspondence pertaining to a grant and is accessible to both ACS program staff and grantees. Grantees may provide access to others at their institution (e.g. grants officers) using the instructions provided below.

All awardees of an ACS grant will need to upload deliverables, and then send an email (correspondence) to the Program Director/Program Coordinator informing the program office of the submitted deliverables. The first deliverable we will be collecting through the **Post Award Management System** is the “Activation Form.” For the Activation Form **only**, please also email Mary LeMahieu at [mary.lemahieu@cancer.org](mailto:mary.lemahieu@cancer.org) in the Research Business office notifying her that you have uploaded your Grant Activation Form.

### **Uploading an Award Deliverable**

- Log onto <https://proposalcentral.altum.com/login.asp>
- **PIs must enter their ProposalCentral username and password in “Applicant Login” to access their award detail information**
- Click on the Awarded link or all Proposal link
- In the Status column, click on the Award Details link
- On the Award Details screen, click on the Deliverables link at the bottom of the screen

The schedule of deliverables due for the award is shown chronologically.

- Go to the **Deliverables Templates** section at the bottom section of the screen to select the appropriate template
- Download and save the template to your computer and complete it.
- To Submit Grant Deliverables and other documents, click the Upload link next to the scheduled deliverable and date
- Click “Browse” button to select the file from your computer.

- Click Save to upload the deliverable. You can replace the uploaded document with another document by clicking Browse...again, selecting a different document from your computer files and click the Save (Adding description of deliverable is optional)
- Click Close

### **Send Email (Correspondence) to an ACS Administrator**

- To send correspondence to Program Director at the ACS, click the “Correspondence” link from the Award Details screen
- From this page, you can see any correspondence that has already been sent by clicking on the Blue link in the Message column
- Use the Respond link to respond directly to a message you have received
- To send a new message, click “Send Correspondence to Program Director” at the top of the page
- Select the administrator(s) who should receive the correspondence email
- Enter a subject and text for the correspondence in the spaces provided
- Click the “Send Email” button to send the email(s) to the selected administrator

Once an application is awarded it moves from proposalCENTRAL into the Post Award Management System. People who previously had access to your application in proposalCENTRAL will not have access to your awarded grant in the Post Award Management System. You may need to allow access to different users than those listed in proposalCENTRAL to enable them to upload various reports on your behalf.

### **To allow to another user access to your award and to submit deliverable**

- Person(s) must be a registered user on proposalCENTRAL. If they are not, ask them to register as a new user at:

<https://proposalcentral.altum.com/>

- Once user is registered, from Award Detail screen click Contacts and User Access link
- Click on Manage User Access To Award at the top of the screen
- Enter and confirm email address of person
- Click on Add button
- Change the Permissions role from View to Administrator
- Click on Save button to activate access for new person

### **To upload other documents such as publications, CV, etc.:**

- Click the "Add Deliverable" link on the Award Deliverable screen
- Select "Other" from the drop down menu next to "Deliverable Type" from the pop up screen
- Type in the "Deliverable Description" (i.e. Publications; CV; etc...)
- Click "Browse" to upload their document
- Click "Save"

Additional information and help can be obtained through proposalCENTRAL customer support desk: By phone: 1-800-875-2562 toll free      By email: [pcsupport@altum.com](mailto:pcsupport@altum.com)

# INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH GRANTS

## INSTRUCTIONS

### CONTENTS

A.	GENERAL INFORMATION .....	3
1.	ACS GRANT APPLICATION SYSTEM .....	3
2.	FORMAT .....	3
3.	UPDATES OF INFORMATION.....	3
4.	REQUIRED INFORMATION .....	4
5.	GENERAL AUDIENCE SUMMARY.....	6
6.	STRUCTURED TECHNICAL ABSTRACT.....	7
7.	PROJECT CODING .....	7
8.	ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATION .....	7
9.	PI DATA .....	9
10.	RESUBMISSION.....	9
11.	APPLICATION SUBMISSION AND REQUIRED SIGNATURES .....	9
B.	PREPARING THE APPLICATION.....	11
1.	APPLICATION TEMPLATES.....	11
2.	TABLE OF CONTENTS (PAGE 1.1) .....	11
3.	REPLY TO PREVIOUS REVIEW (RESUBMISSIONS AND RENEWALS) (PAGE 2.1) .....	11
4.	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM (PAGE 3.1).....	12
5.	CAREER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES FOR BEGINNING INVESTIGATORS (PAGE 4.1) .	13
6.	COMPOSITION OF LOCAL INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE (PAGE 5.1).....	13
7.	BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION (PAGES 6.1 & 7.1) .....	14
8.	DOCUMENTATION OF INTERACTION WITH THE LOCAL AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY (PAGE 8.1) .....	14
9.	PROCEDURE FOR PUBLICIZING AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS (PAGE 9.1).....	14
10.	HOW ALLOCATIONS ARE TO BE MADE (PAGE 10.1).....	15
11.	JUSTIFICATION FOR FUNDS REQUESTED (PAGE 11.1) .....	15
12.	DOCUMENTATION OF APPLICANT POOL SIZE (NEW APPLICATIONS ONLY) (PAGE 12.1).....	16
13.	EXAMPLES OF RESEARCH TO BE SUPPORTED (NEW APPLICATIONS ONLY) (PAGE 13.1).....	16
14.	SUMMARY TABLES (PAGES 12.1 – 17.1) .....	16
15.	AWARDEE PROJECTS .....	17

16. APPLICATION APPENDIX..... 18  
APPENDIX A: SAMPLE OF GENERAL AUDIENCE SUMMARY ..... 19  
APPENDIX B: CRITERIA FOR THE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS ..... 20

## A. GENERAL INFORMATION

### 1. ACS GRANT APPLICATION SYSTEM

Access the American Cancer Society Research site at [www.cancer.org](http://www.cancer.org).

- Select “Our Research” followed by “Apply for Grant” > “Grant Types”
- Select link to grant type, which allows access to the electronic application process at proposalCENTRAL
- Follow the sequential instructions for login/register, completion, and submission
- Key steps:
  - “Create New Proposal” > “Grant Types”> “Apply Now”
  - Enter Project Title (unless provided) > SAVE (permits access to other application components)
  - Saved applications are stored under the “Manage Proposals”
- See proposalCENTRAL login page for tutorials and additional details about the grant application process
- Alternatively, click “Help” or contact ALTUM Customer Service at [pcsupport@altum.com](mailto:pcsupport@altum.com) or 1-800-875-2562

### 2. FORMAT

- Insert Principal Investigator (PI) name in the header for each template of the application. Do not change the footers on the templates.
- Application documents may be single or double-sided (if single spacing, a space between paragraphs is recommended)
- **Type size:** 12-point Times New Roman or 11-point Arial as the minimum font size for the text; 10-point Times New Roman or 9-point Arial font type may be used for figures, legends, and tables
- **Margins:**  $\geq 0.5$  inches all around, unless a form with different margins is supplied in the Application Templates
- **Page numbering:**
  - Cover Pages-** Cover pages (Signature Page, Contact Page, General Audience Summary and Structure Technical Abstract, if applicable) are not numbered.
  - Proposal Sections-** Proposal sections are listed in the Table of Contents and must be independently numbered in the upper right-hand corner
  - Appendix:** The Appendix is not numbered.

### 3. UPDATES OF INFORMATION

**Withdrawal of application:** Notify the Society promptly, **in writing**, if an application is to be withdrawn. A letter (or email) to the Program Director (indicated in the application acknowledgment letter) should include the PI name, application number, and the reason for withdrawal. If the project has been funded by another organization, please include that funding agency.



**Change of address:** Notify the Society in writing (email) if a mailing address, email address, or phone number has changed since a submission. Please include the PI name and application number on the correspondence and update your information in proposalCENTRAL.

**Change of institution:** If you change institutions between application submission and peer review, contact the Program Director (identified in the application acknowledgment letter). He/she will inform as to whether the application can be reviewed that cycle.

#### 4. REQUIRED INFORMATION

*Note: Not all fields are required for all applications; see mechanism-specific instructions*

**Project Title:** The title should not exceed 75 characters in length (including spaces). Please avoid abbreviation, if possible.

**Principal Investigator/Applicant Information:** Some (or all) of the required information may be populated from your profile. This information was provided when you registered on proposalCENTRAL and completed the Professional Profile. If any information is outdated, update the Professional Profile before finalizing this section and submitting an application. Please keep contact information current.

**Key Personnel:** Individuals who contribute to the scientific development or execution of a project in a substantive, measurable way (whether they receive salaries or compensation under the grant) are considered Key Personnel. **NB: The PI is always considered Key Personnel but do not list them under key personnel on proposalCENTRAL.** Typically, key Personnel have doctoral or other professional degrees, although individuals at the master's or baccalaureate level (such as graduate students and research assistants) may be considered Key Personnel if they meet this definition. Since Key Personnel must devote measurable effort to the project, "zero percent" effort or "as needed" are not acceptable levels of involvement.

The **Principal Investigator** assumes the authority and responsibility to direct the project. The American Cancer Society does not permit applications to be directed by Co-Principal Investigators.

A **Co-Investigator** is a vital scientific contributor (at the same or a different institution), often bringing a needed expertise to the research team. He/she commits some level of measurable effort to the project and is, therefore, always designated as Key Personnel whether being compensated or otherwise.

A **Collaborator** plays a lesser role in the thinking and logistics of the project than a Co-Investigator. Depending on the role and effort, a collaborator may be designated as Key Personnel and may be compensated.

A **Consultant** provides expert advice and opinion on what needs to be done, most often for a fee. Generally, a consultant is not considered Key Personnel. However, if the consultant contributes

to the scientific development or execution of a project substantively and measurably, he/she should be designated as such.

Other personnel (e.g., **Mentor** and **Preceptor**) are applicable for some mentored and health professional training grants, e.g., Doctoral Scholarships in Cancer Nursing. *See mechanism-specific instructions for definitions and required supporting documents.*

A **Subcontractor** evaluates a need and performs work relating to that need for a fee. A subcontractor is **not** considered Key Personnel.

### REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS FOR NAMED PERSONNEL

Personnel	Designated “Key”	Biosketch	“Other support” Documentation	Included in Budget & Justification	Letters
Principal Investigator	Yes <sup>a</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
Co-Investigator	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Letter of Agreement
Collaborator	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Letter of Agreement
	No	No	No	No	
Consultant	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Letter of Agreement
	No	No	No	No	
Subcontractor	No	No	No	Yes <sup>c</sup>	Letter of Agreement
Mentor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Letter of Commitment

<sup>a</sup> PI is always considered key personnel, but supporting documents should **not** be duplicated in the Key Personnel section on proposalCENTRAL

<sup>b</sup> Excluding postdoctoral fellows, technicians, and graduate students

<sup>c</sup> Total subcontract amount is listed in the main budget with details in the subcontractor budget page and justification form.

**Citizenship Status:** Indicate your current citizenship status and country of citizenship. (mandatory).

**Justification of Eligibility:** Applicants must satisfy all eligibility requirements defined for each application type. Indicate when (months and years) of awarding of terminal degree and first independent faculty position (or equivalent), if applicable. If you have a letter from the American Cancer Society Eligibility Committee, include in the Appendix and in the Table of Contents and denote in the justification space provided.

**Justification of Designation “Priority Focus in Health Equity Research”:** Indicate on the title page “Health Equity” if the proposal falls into the Priority Focus (Health Equity Research) in the Cancer Control and Prevention Research Program.

**Space:** If applicable, indicate the approximate area of independent research space provided by your institution to support your research program and the name of the department head responsible for verification of this commitment. You must insert a value for square footage on the electronic form, even if that number is zero.

**Institutional Official:** Indicate the name and address of the official authorized to sign for the institution. Institutional officials must sign the front page; we do not require original signatures (electronic signatures are acceptable). Provide a mailing address for disbursement of funds, in the event that the grant is awarded funding.

**Department Chair:** Indicate the name, department, and email address of the department head. The department head must sign the front page to affirm the title/position of the PI and the committed resources.

**Primary Mentor:** Please fill out all fields for mentor information (if applicable).

**Additional Mentor (s):** Please fill out all fields for additional mentor information (if applicable).

## 5. GENERAL AUDIENCE SUMMARY

The general audience summary provides an overview of the proposed research to people who are *not* trained in the sciences. This summary may be read by peer review stakeholders, ACS staff members, potential donors, and the public. **Stakeholders** are individuals without formal scientific or medical training, who are full voting members of all peer review panels. The stakeholder uses the general summary to evaluate how the proposed work will benefit cancer patients and their families (i.e., the cancer relevancy). **ACS staff members**, who work with major donors, use these summaries to identify projects that align with the interests of donors seeking to support specific areas of cancer research. Staff may also use the summary for communicating to local media about ACS-funded studies. Summaries of all grants funded by the Society are made available to the **public**. Therefore, do not include proprietary/confidential information.

The general audience summary should *not* duplicate the structured technical abstract. It should be written in an understandable way for the general public and concisely describe the background, significance, question(s) being asked, information to be obtained, and potential impact. If symbols or Greek characters must be used, they should be spelled out to avoid formatting problems. **See examples of General Audience Summaries in the Appendix.**

*This form is limited to 3,000 characters (including spaces) and will truncate at that point. Please adhere to the character limit to prevent readers (including peer reviewers) from fully appreciating the 'big picture perspective' of the proposal.*

## 6. STRUCTURED TECHNICAL ABSTRACT

*Note: not all applications require a structured technical abstract.*

The structured technical abstract is a summary of the proposed research or scholarly project for **general scientific** audiences (see Appendix for an example).

Please organize into the following sections:

- **Background**
- **Objective/Hypothesis**
- **Specific Aims**
- **Study Design**

*Emphasize those elements you consider most relevant to assignment of the proposal for peer review. This form is limited to 3,000 characters (including spaces) and will truncate at that point. Please adhere to the character limit to prevent peer reviewers from fully appreciating the technical synopsis and scientific rationale.*

## 7. PROJECT CODING

*Note: Project coding is not considered at peer review. Red asterisks indicate required fields (not all grant types require project coding).*

Donors often have interests in funding specific types of cancer research. Selection of project codes by applicants allows for the identification of proposals for consideration of donor-driven special funding. This information also assists the Society in communicating the research portfolio to the public.

Select the most appropriate Areas of Research (Common Scientific Outline –CSO) and Types of Cancer. **Please note that relevant items may be included under Resources and Infrastructure Related to [specific area]. See the Appendix for specific terms and examples.**

## 8. ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATION

All activities involving human subjects and vertebrate animals must be approved by the appropriate institutional committee before the application will be funded by the American Cancer Society. Compliance with current US Department of Health and Human Services and ACS guidelines for conflict of interest, recombinant DNA, and scientific misconduct is also required. **The signature of the institutional official verifies these approval and compliance mandates.**

**Vertebrate animals.** Every proposal involving vertebrate animals must be approved by an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), in accordance with Public Health Service Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, before the application will be

funded by the American Cancer Society. Enter the date of the most recent IACUC approval in the space provided.

All research supported by the ACS (including subcontracted activities) involving vertebrate animals must be conducted at performance sites, which are covered under an approved Animal Welfare Assurance. **It is the responsibility of the institution to immediately report to American Cancer Society any action including recertification or loss of IACUC approval that is pertinent to the work described in the grant application.**

**Human Subjects.** All proposed research projects involving human subjects must be approved by an Institutional Review Board (IRB).

The institution must be approved from the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) of the US Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Enter the institution's Assurance of Compliance number(s). Copies of the DHHS policy and information regarding the assured status and assurance numbers of institutions may be obtained from OHRP. The definitions and further sources of clarification are found in the NIH Grants Policy Statement (Revised 12/03), [www.grants.nih.gov/grants/policy](http://www.grants.nih.gov/grants/policy), or the NIH Office of Extramural Research.

If institutional review of human subjects or vertebrate animal use has not been finalized before the submission date of the application, you must indicate that approval is pending on the certification page and give the appropriate institutional reference numbers, if available. ***Certification of the institutional committee review, clearly labeled with the assigned American Cancer Society application number, must be received prior to activation of a grant for funding. Failure to supply the ACS with completed IRB and/or IACUC certifications prior to the approved start of funding will result in withholding of payments and may result in cancellation of funding-***

Note: Applications for the Institutional Research Grant (IRG) and some Health Professional Training Grants do not require submission of IRB and IACUC certifications. Regardless, institutions must comply with the requirements described above to use American Cancer Society grant funding for activities involving human subjects or vertebrate animals.

**If a grant is funded, it is the responsibility of the institution to immediately report to American Cancer Society any action including recertification or loss of IRB approval, which occurs during the term of the award that is related to the work described in the grant application.**

## 9. PI DATA

*Submit this section electronically only.*

The requested PI information is for statistical purposes only (e.g. not considered at peer review). This section will not print with the cover pages and should not to be submitted with your paper copy.

## 10. RESUBMISSION

**All resubmissions must create a new application on proposalCENTRAL.** Applications that are not initially funded can generally be resubmitted twice. Postdoctoral Fellowship applications are an exception with only one resubmission. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Program Director prior to resubmission to discuss the previous review.

Resubmission guidelines:

- Submit a complete application with a current date—electronic and paper copies.
- The title of the project can be altered, but should be marked as a first or second resubmission.
- Select the appropriate application number from the list of your prior submissions on proposalCENTRAL.
- The review committee code (e.g. TBE, CCE, CPPB, etc.) from the previous application must be provided where requested on the title page.
- A “Reply to Previous Review”, not to exceed 3 pages, should be placed where indicated in the Table of Contents of the Application Templates section. It should clearly address the points raised in the previous review and direct the reader to the specific sections of the text where revisions have been made. Text revised in response to the reviewers’ comments should be designated (e.g.: bold type, highlighting, line in the margin, underlining, etc.). Reviewers’ previous critiques should be inserted immediately after the “Reply to Previous Reviews” as indicated in the Table of Contents.

## 11. APPLICATION SUBMISSION AND REQUIRED SIGNATURES

Applications must be submitted in two formats: an electronic version and one paper copy.

### A. ELECTRONIC APPLICATION

- **All application attachments, including the Appendix, must be uploaded as .pdf documents, with the exception of the signed copy of the front page (this is only to be submitted with the paper copy).** See proposalCENTRAL FAQ or contact support at 1-800-875-2562 for assistance.
- Validate the application on proposalCENTRAL. An application that has not been validated cannot be electronically submitted.
- If any modifications are made to the proposal during the signature process, make sure the electronic and paper versions are consistent.

- Technical questions regarding the electronic application process, should be directed to Altum at [pcsupport@altum.com](mailto:pcsupport@altum.com) or 1-800-875-2562.
- Electronic applications must be submitted on proposalCENTRAL by close of business (5:00 PM EST) on the specified deadline date. **If the deadline falls on a weekend or holiday, applications will be accepted the following business day.**

**Note: You will not be able to make any changes to the forms or upload any modifications to the files after submission.**

## **B. PAPER COPY**

- The paper copy must include the signatures (front page) and contact information (second page) for the:
  - Applicant
  - Institutional Official
  - Department Head
- Original signatures are not required (electronic signatures are acceptable). See program-specific instructions for additional required signatures. Please confirm that all required signatures have been collected before mailing the paper copy.
- Print application via proposalCENTRAL. (“Print” on the menu > select “Print Signature Pages and Attached PDF Files”). **Do not print cover pages for an application before validation.**
- Note that cover pages are not uploaded to proposalCENTRAL and are only mailed with your paper version.

Please secure the application with a rubber band or clip rather than stapling and mail only one application per package to:

**The American Cancer Society  
Extramural Research Department  
250 Williams Street NW  
Atlanta, GA 30303  
404-329-7558**

**A single paper copy of the application must be received by the American Cancer Society Corporate Center no later than 5:00 PM (EST) on the next business day following the deadline date for the electronic submission.**

## **B. PREPARING THE APPLICATION**

Please read carefully the requirements set forth in the **POLICIES, INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH GRANTS**, before completing the application. Prospective applicants who have questions should contact the Program Director for clarification prior to submission of an application. Questions should be directed to:

Virginia (Ginger) Krawiec, MPA  
Director, Institutional Research Grants  
Stella Jones, Program Coordinator  
404-329-5734  
stella.jones@cancer.org

### **1. APPLICATION TEMPLATES**

An application consists of several sections that must be uploaded before the online application is submitted. Templates for these sections are available once an application is started on proposalCENTRAL. The templates must be downloaded to a computer and completed offline using word processing software. Detailed below are the instructions for completing the individual sections. *The sections must be converted into .pdf documents before being uploaded. Please see proposalCENTRAL's FAQ or call support at 1-800-875-2562 if you need assistance.*

### **2. TABLE OF CONTENTS (PAGE 1.1)**

The Table of Contents is pre-numbered, corresponding to the page numbers for the first page of each application section. All pages of the application should be numbered sequentially. To complete the Table of Contents for a new application, delete the (Renewals Only) section. To complete the Table of Contents for a renewal application, delete the (New Applications Only) section.

### **3. REPLY TO PREVIOUS REVIEW (RESUBMISSIONS AND RENEWALS) (PAGE 2.1)**

*IF THE APPLICATION IS A NEW SUBMISSION, upload the provided template with "Not Applicable" in the body.*

*IF THE APPLICATION IS A RESUBMISSION, it must be identified as such on the cover page. This section must be completed and should clearly and briefly address the points raised in the previous reviews and direct the reader to the specific sections where text revisions have been made. Do not exceed three pages. Text changed in response to reviewers' comments should be identifiable in the revised application (e.g. bold type, line in the margin, underlining, etc.).*

*IF THE APPLICATION IS A RENEWAL, it must be identified as such on the cover page. The peer review committee reviews the critiques of the most recent application as part of the evaluation of a new proposal. Effective January 2012, renewal applications also must include*



the critiques of the previous application, and document progress made toward addressing the points made by the reviewers by completing the Reply to Previous Review.

Copies of the previous critiques should be inserted immediately after the Reply to Previous Review as illustrated in the Table of Contents. Electronic copies of the critiques for your previous submission can be downloaded from your “Submitted” page on proposalCENTRAL. Select the link to “View Review Info” then “View Summary Statement” and save the document to your computer. Upload the document to your application with the other proposal sections.

#### **4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM (PAGE 3.1)**

(This section must be limited to four pages and should not duplicate information provided elsewhere in the application.)

This should be an overview of the academic environment for the proposed IRG program, including:

- The nature of the institution, e.g., university, academic health center, freestanding research facility, etc. The principal investigator should also use this section to describe unique aspects of the institution, such as service to special populations, location, and any special resources.

If a consortium program is proposed, describe the arrangement with the other institution(s). Include information about the relationship between the institutions, the status of cancer research at the other site(s), the expected growth in the IRG applicant pool, the inclusion of faculty from the other institution on the IRG review committee [along with biographical sketches (see Section 7)], and the opportunities for their beginning investigators to access mentoring resources. A memorandum of agreement or similar document also may be included in the application appendix.

- Ongoing and planned cancer-related activities, especially the cancer research program. Any strategic efforts underway at the institution to expand cancer research and other cancer-related activities should be described.
- The importance of this grant to the institution as a whole, particularly how the IRG will be used to leverage other resources to support cancer research and beginning investigators. If this application is a renewal of an IRG that is no longer in effect, please explain funding lapses of more than one year.
- Information about the institution’s replenishing pool of beginning investigators interested in cancer research. Specifically, the peer review committee is interested in knowing the percentage of new faculty annually recruited to the institution, what proportion of these are beginning **independent** researchers interested in cancer and the success rate of junior faculty in obtaining national competitive funding in the area of cancer research. Renewal applications should also highlight any outstanding accomplishments by the individual awardees, both present and past. If titles are different from the standard academic titles, the institution should explain (e.g., is an "instructor" an independent principal investigator?).

## 5. CAREER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES FOR BEGINNING INVESTIGATORS (PAGE 4.1)

Describe the institution's ongoing or new activities to promote career development that are available to junior faculty affiliated with the IRG program. Examples of these activities include but are not limited to:

- mentoring and advisement by senior faculty with established cancer research careers;
- [guidance on publishing scientific results](#)
- seminars on grant writing and research funding, teaching and mentoring, publishing, personnel/lab/office management, etc.;
- critiques of draft applications for national peer reviewed research grants;
- guidance on developing collaborative research relationships, and
- balancing an academic career and one's personal life.

## 6. COMPOSITION OF LOCAL INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE (PAGE 5.1)

The principal investigator of the grant will chair this Committee. Describe the qualifications of the principal investigator to lead the IRG program, including research interests and accomplishments, mentoring experience, grant funding history, publication history, and administrative experience.

If this is a renewal application, and a change in the chair of the local IRG review committee / IRG principal investigator has occurred or is being proposed, please explain the reason for the change.

The local IRG Review Committee should be composed of representatives from all the health science schools and colleges of the institution. Summarize the committee composition. See the example below for the preferred format.

	Basic Research	Clinical Research	Cancer Control and Population Sciences	Total
Professor	5	2	2	9
Associate Professor	2	2	3	7
Assistant Professor	2	3	1	6
Other			1	1
Total	9	7	7	23
Percentage	40%	30%	30%	100%

Using the table provided, list the names, titles, departments, schools, and research interests of the members of the local IRG Review Committee. *Include the names and titles/affiliations of the ACS representatives.*

## 7. BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION (PAGES 6.1 & 7.1)

Use the Biographical Sketch template provided or copies thereof to provide the requested information on all *academic* members of the local IRG Review Committee. Committee members' research grant funding history should be included, and will be used to assess both grant experience and ability to guide beginning investigators.

**Positions and Honors.** List in chronological order previous positions, concluding with your present position. State duration, title, and institution. List any honors.

**Publications.** Give complete references for all peer reviewed publications over the last five years, including titles; begin each citation on a new line. If the number of publications is extensive, you may give a partial listing; indicate total number of publications (excluding abstracts, non-peer reviewed articles or book chapters).

This information is required regardless of whether you have provided it before, since previous applications are not available to the Society's Peer Review Committee on Institutional Research Grants. Do not exceed three pages per person for total biographical information. Please see the **POLICIES: ANSWERS TO FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS** for additional information about the local IRG Review Committee.

## 8. DOCUMENTATION OF INTERACTION WITH THE LOCAL AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY (PAGE 8.1)

A demonstrated interaction between the local American Cancer Society and ACS Cancer Action Network, and the institution, *especially the IRG pilot project grantees*, is an essential part of the application. Interaction between an institution with an IRG and the local American Cancer Society is a particularly useful means for increasing the awareness of Division volunteers and staff about the research that their effort and dollars support. To foster communication about the IRG Program with volunteers and staff in the Society's Divisions, institutions are **expected** to include one or two Division representatives as members of the local IRG Committee. For new applications, the principal investigator and the institution should work together with the appropriate local American Cancer Society staff to formulate an interaction plan *if none exists*. The principal investigator should contact the National Program Director for Institutional Research Grants for assistance if needed. A letter of support from the Division may be included in the Appendix. Please see the **POLICIES: ANSWERS TO FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS** for examples of successful interactions.

## 9. PROCEDURE FOR PUBLICIZING AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS (PAGE 9.1)

Explain how all qualified individuals are to be informed about the availability of these funds, e.g., university newsletters, memoranda, notices. Include examples in the Appendix.

## 10. HOW ALLOCATIONS ARE TO BE MADE (PAGE 10.1)

Explain in detail the local IRG Review Committee operations. This description should include:

- The qualifications of the Principal Investigator, including his/her grant funding history, to serve as the chair of the local IRG Review Committee.
- The processes for member selection and rotation, and participation in the review process, including how conflicts of interest are handled.
- The committee review process, including the frequency and timing of meetings, the application assignment, review and ranking process (including special interest award applications, *and if relevant, the procedure for competitively renewing grants for a second year*). If the IRG review committee relates in some way to another intramural grant reviewing body, explain how the IRG application review and the allocation of IRG funding is kept separate.
- The type of feedback provided to applicants, as well as how awardees are made aware that their support comes from the American Cancer Society. Programs are encouraged to provide written feedback to all applicants and to include unsuccessful applicants in any mentoring activities that are offered to IRG pilot project grant recipients.
- Any other activities related to the IRG program, e.g., presentations of the results of IRG-funded projects, etc.

## 11. JUSTIFICATION FOR FUNDS REQUESTED (PAGE 11.1)

This section must include the table provided in the template document; complete it by inserting the information requested about your current level of IRG funding (if applicable) and the funding request for the current application. (These latter amounts must agree with the numbers provided on the cover page of your printed application.)

For estimating the amount of funds to be requested, it may be assumed that approximately 30% of the individual applications received for review by the local IRG Review Committee will be funded. The standard amount for pilot project grants is \$30,000 per year; if smaller awards are proposed to be made, please explain the rationale for doing so. Institutions are discouraged from awarding less than the maximum amount from ACS funds. If matching funds are to be provided by the institution, please explain their nature and amount. If any funds are used to supplement the pilot project awards, please describe.

**Applicant Pool:** The amount of funds requested must be based on the size of the pool of applicants eligible for pilot project grants. Describe here the number of beginning investigators engaged in cancer research who are not principal investigators on nationally competitive research grants (but who are eligible to apply for them), and the anticipated number of new junior faculty positions available during a given year within the institution or group of institutions.

**Special Interest Awards:** If the application includes a request for one Special Interest pilot project award each year, specific justification must be provided. Describe how this area (see the Policies for appropriate areas of research) fits into the institution's programmatic goals and its

suitability to support the program, ongoing research in the area, and the pool of potential applicants.

**Other Support:** All applications must also justify the need for funding to permit junior faculty to initiate promising pilot projects in cancer research. State other sources and amounts of pilot project funding available (local, institutional, Cancer Center Core Grant, etc.).

**Indirect Costs:** Indirect costs are not allowed on Institutional Research Grants.

If this is a renewal application, the following two sections should be deleted from the Table of Contents and the templates will not be used:

## **12. DOCUMENTATION OF APPLICANT POOL SIZE (NEW APPLICATIONS ONLY) (PAGE 12.1)**

List all junior faculty who are interested in cancer-related research, including any positions that are anticipated to be added. It is acceptable to include approved but unfilled positions marked as TBD. Exclude junior faculty who already hold national competitive research grants.

(Information about the latter group is requested under **DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM**.)

Refer to the **POLICIES: REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLICANTS FOR IRG PILOT PROJECT GRANTS**, for specific eligibility guidelines.

## **13. EXAMPLES OF RESEARCH TO BE SUPPORTED (NEW APPLICATIONS ONLY) (PAGE 13.1)**

Using the forms provided, include approximately five examples of research to be supported if funds are awarded. Provide information about the investigator and the proposed pilot project. Each individual project description should be limited to one page.

Applications for competitive renewal of an IRG must include the following sections. If this is a new application, these sections should be deleted from the Table of Contents and their templates will not be used:

## **14. SUMMARY TABLES (PAGES 12.1 – 17.1)**

Using the templates for Tables I through VI, please provide the requested information for the past [seven](#) award years, or for the number of years in effect for grants of less duration. *Tables need to be accurate, internally consistent, and only reflect publications and grants that acknowledge American Cancer Society funding (Tables III and IV).*

Note: Supplemental materials will be accepted after the April 1 deadline through May 15. However, these items should be limited to updated information about past awardees, i.e., additional grants received, articles published, or information about the recent activities of the institution's IRG Review Committee.

### **TABLE I. SUMMARY OF PILOT PROJECT GRANTS**

Starting with the just completed grant year (January – December) and working backward, please provide a summary of pilot project grants to individuals for the last [seven](#) years. (For first time renewals, the number of years will be less.) Give the academic title of the investigator at the time of the award, and also the current title and institution, if different from the awarding

institution. If relevant, the award amount should reflect any additional matching funds (Note: In these cases, the amount may be more than the \$30,000 limit per individual award).

#### **TABLE II. SUMMARY OF UNFUNDED APPLICATIONS**

Starting with the most recently completed grant year (January-December) and working backward, please provide the information requested.

#### **TABLE III. SEVEN YEAR SUMMARY OF PUBLICATIONS RESULTING FROM THIS SUPPORT**

For all of the awardees listed in TABLE I (except those currently receiving funding), provide the information requested. List only published or in press peer reviewed publications based on work supported by the IRG pilot project award or by grants resulting from the IRG pilot project award. Include all authors, year of publication, title, journal, volume, and page numbers.). *Please note: publications based on work supported by the IRG pilot project award that do NOT include acknowledgement of ACS funding may NOT be included in this table.*

#### **TABLE IV. SUMMARY OF GRANTS RESULTING FROM THIS SUPPORT**

List only national competitive grants that have been received or are pending as a result of the **IRG pilot project funding, including the role of the PI on the grant.** Unrelated grants obtained by the awardees may be listed in the Individual Progress Reports (but also should be counted in Table VI).

#### **TABLE V. SEVEN YEAR SUMMARY OF FUNDING**

Starting with the most recent year and working backward, please tabulate the percent of applications funded for the past seven years.

#### **TABLE VI. SUMMARY OF ALL PUBLICATIONS AND GRANTS OBTAINED**

Going back seven years, but excluding awardees currently receiving funding, please provide for each individual listed in TABLE I, the total number of grants awarded and number of publications as a result of IRG pilot project grant funding. **(This is a summary of the information provided in Tables III and IV.)**

Provide also numbers of grants and publications obtained by IRG awardees resulting from work unrelated to the IRG award during the same seven-year period. Provide subtotals for each year and an overall total in the space indicated. (Please note: this information should coincide with that provided in the Individual Progress Reports.)

### **15. AWARDEE PROJECTS**

(Please note that if you do not have an electronic version of items a-b, you may provide this information in the Appendix of the paper copies that you submit to the American Cancer Society.)

- a. Current Pilot Project Grant Applications (*up to 5 pages each*)  
Please include the applications for pilot project grants for all current (year) awardees. If the provided template is not used, the applications should follow the format of the template, and include a Biographical Information Page(s).
- b. Individual IRG Progress Reports (2-3 pages each)

Using the provided template or following its format, please provide progress reports for all pilot projects supported by allocations from the IRG that were completed during the last **two** years. Pilot project grantees should be instructed to summarize the work accomplished under the grant and the results achieved **[NEW: one-page limit]**. Include publications and any national grants obtained as a result of IRG funding (i.e., **after** the pilot project award period). List the names of all authors, title, journal, and page number for all relevant publications, but do not include manuscripts in preparation. **Attach a copy of the publication cover page including the abstract and acknowledgement of ACS funding for each relevant publication.** Information about national grants should include the principal investigator's **role**, project title, awarding agency, amount of support (direct costs), and the term of the award.

Note: these reports should be updated each year following the IRG pilot project award period, and the revision date noted on the report. **The principal investigator will need to collect progress reports from the last seven years of IRG funding, but only those from pilot projects completed in the last two years need to be included in the application.**

## **16. APPLICATION APPENDIX**

In addition to the application templates, other key documents may be uploaded and submitted as part of the application. However, applicants are urged to keep this section as brief as possible.

Include here:

- Examples of how the local IRG Review Committee publicizes the availability of funds
- Evidence of interaction with the local American Cancer Society
- MOU documenting a consortium arrangement with another institution

Appended materials may also include:

- Letter of support from the American Cancer Society Region
- Letters of support from key individuals at the institution

It is not necessary to number the pages of the appendix, but list the items in the Table of Contents of the application.

## **APPENDIX A: SAMPLE OF GENERAL AUDIENCE SUMMARY**

The American Cancer Society Institutional Research Grant (ACS IRG) is an essential component used by the University to recruit new faculty into cancer research and promote the nurturing for the ideas of junior faculty already involved in cancer research. Over the years, the ACS IRG has successfully fostered cancer interests among young investigators, providing them with a mechanism by which they can obtain small grants for testing their ideas, and positioning them to successfully compete for extramural peer-reviewed research grants.

The leadership of the University and especially the Comprehensive Cancer Center understands that new ideas, many of which come from new researchers in their first faculty positions, can have a substantial impact on the advancement of biomedical research. The institution has added a substantial number of junior faculty over the past decade in diverse disciplines that range from basic molecular biology to psychosocial sciences. This has enlarged the pool of eligible applicants for ACS IRG funding. In addition, the institutional IRG program has placed increasing emphasis on the identification of potential applicants, which has resulted in a substantial increase in the number of applications. The institution's IRG review committee has thus needed to be expanded and diversified.

The present renewal application also includes a new mentoring plan to assure that awardees are properly advised once an award is made, and receive training that will help them to secure peer-reviewed funding. Recognizing the importance and prestige of the American Cancer Society Institutional Research Grant for young investigators and to help attract the best young scientists, the University and Cancer Center have committed \$15,000 in matching funds for each ACS IRG pilot project award, bringing the \$30,000 award to \$45,000 per investigator.

The ACS IRG also plays an important role in fostering the extensive interaction between the University and the American Cancer Society. Over the years, this relationship has been mutually beneficial to both organizations, but more importantly to the area's cancer patients and their families.



## APPENDIX B: CRITERIA FOR THE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS

The following items are used by reviewers in evaluating applications for the Institutional Research Grants.

Effective January 2012, renewal applications must include the critiques of the previous application and document progress made toward addressing the points made by the reviewers. Resubmitted applications should also include this section. Evaluate the adequacy of the response.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM:** This should be an overview of the academic environment, and the potential applicant pool size. When describing the nature of the institution, the principal investigator should also outline any unique aspects of the institution. Any strategic efforts underway at the institution to expand cancer-related activities, especially research, which could impact upon faculty recruitment should be described.

The importance of this grant to the institution, with an explanation of how the IRG will be used to leverage resources to support the institution's beginning cancer researchers must be included. If this application is a renewal of an IRG that is no longer in effect, and for which funding has lapsed for more than one year, an explanation should be provided.

The information about the applicant pool should include the percentage of new faculty annually recruited to the institution, what proportion of these would be potential applicants for IRG pilot project funding, and the overall success rate of junior faculty in obtaining national peer reviewed cancer research funding. Renewal applications should highlight any outstanding accomplishments by the individual awardees. If faculty titles at the institution are different from the standard academic titles, the applicant should explain (e.g., is an "instructor" an independent principal investigator?).

### **CAREER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES FOR BEGINNING INVESTIGATORS:**

Institutions are expected to document activities designed to promote the career development of the recipients of IRG pilot project grants, such as mentoring by established cancer researchers, grant-writing seminars, guidance on developing research collaborations, etc.

**LOCAL COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:** Are the qualifications of the principal investigator to serve as the committee chair provided? Look for broad representation across all schools and departments from which applications might be expected; a good balance of senior and junior, clinical and basic, as well as invitations to ACS representatives to participate.

**INTERACTION WITH LOCAL ACS:** Is there evidence of interaction between the institution, *including IRG pilot project grantees*, and the local Region office of the American Cancer Society or with the ACS Cancer Action Network? For example, are events where the local staff or volunteers get to meet the individual awardees held? If not, has any attempt been made by the institution to nurture such interactions? (In some areas of the country, this is the only ACS grant there is, and special consideration should be given for these interactions.)

**PROCEDURE FOR PUBLICIZING AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS:** How does the committee advertise—electronic mail, list servers, bulletin boards, campus newsletters, letters to new faculty? Do all departments and schools know about the grant? Are the numbers of applications commensurate with the pool size?

**OPERATIONS (HOW ALLOCATIONS ARE TO BE MADE):** The committee's sole charge should be to review the ACS IRG applications, and not any applications funded from other sources. Does the committee meet once or twice each year? How does the committee avoid conflicts of interest? Is there appropriate rotation after several years of service? How are

applications ranked? How are special interest applications evaluated? Is there feedback to the applicants?

**JUSTIFICATION OF FUNDS REQUESTED:** What other cancer research support is available at the institution? Is the projected or actual applicant pool size sufficient to justify the funds requested? If a renewal application, does the number of applications agree with the reported pool size? Is the amount requested adequate to fund all of the outstanding applications? Conversely, are non-meritorious applications being funded? There should be detailed information about any matching funds provided by the institution. If any funds are used to supplement the pilot project awards, those should be described as well.

**DOCUMENTATION OF POOL SIZE** (*new applications only*): How many junior investigators interested in cancer research are presently at the institution, and how many are expected to be recruited over the next few years? Is this pool sufficient?

**EXAMPLES OF RESEARCH TO BE SUPPORTED** (*new applications only*): Are the examples of pilot projects given high quality cancer research?

**APPLICATIONS AND AWARDS:** How many applications are received, approved, and funded? What is the funding rate? What is the range of priority scores? Are there enough special interest applications to warrant a special award, if any? Are the grantees made aware that this money comes from the ACS rather than the institution? Are pilot project grants distributed broadly across the institution or concentrated in one school or center?

**PUBLICATIONS AND GRANTS:** This is an important part of the evaluation of renewal requests for continued support. Tracking of publications and awards should go back for seven years (excluding the current year) or the length of the award, if less. Consider the overall productivity of the researchers supported by IRG funds (*i.e., all publications and grants, not just those resulting from their IRG pilot projects*). *Verify that only those that acknowledge ACS funding are listed.* The cancer relevance of the research supported by individual allocations is also a factor in the evaluation of renewal requests for continued support.