

**Date:** March 13, 2007

**To:** All SVM and Diagnostic Laboratory Faculty (Assistant Professor and above)

**From:** SVM Research Committee: CBS Member TBD, Joseph Francis (CBS); Jim Miller, Fain-ting Liang (PBS); Amy Grooters, Jill Johnson (VCS); Thomas Klei, *ex officio*.  
Jim Miller, Chair

**Subject:** 2007-08 Request for Multiyear CORP grant proposals

The intended use of these funds is three fold; 1. To support investigators in pursuit of extramural funding by providing a significant amount of support over a 2 year grant cycle. We are particularly interested in collaborative teams and new investigators. The goal of the applications is to acquire sufficient preliminary data to support the submission of a new major federally funded grant application by the end of this two year period and 2. Funds can also be requested to serve as a bridge in the case where a major federal grant has been lost during the preceding year. In the case of the later an introductory statement should be included together with the summary of the most recent critique and agency score. 3. To assist in the response to a critique for a major grant that received a very promising score.

In anticipation of funding from the SVM Competitive Organized Research Program, we invite submission of research grant proposals for fiscal year 2007-2008. The requested funds for each grant can be for an amount up to \$30,000 per year with a two-year maximum of recurrent funding. The principal investigator must be an SVM/Diagnostic Laboratory Faculty. Only one proposal per principal investigator may be submitted. Collaborative efforts enlisting other SVM faculty in co-principal investigator roles and other LSU-based investigators will be preferred.

The grants will be critiqued and ranked by a committee of external panel of reviewers based principally upon scientific merit, innovation, qualifications of investigators, interdepartmental collaboration, feasibility, likelihood to lead to extramural funding, likelihood of successful completion, and appropriateness of the budget. A list of five potential reviewers is also requested including address, emails, and phone numbers. The Research Committee will use these reviewers to provide guidance in selecting proposals to be funded.

The proposal must be a clearly defined project that addresses specific questions with definable scientific output and that can be completed within the proposed period of funding. The grant application must conform to the guidelines established for NIH R21 applications (see <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/r21.htm> for details). **Grant applications that do not conform to this standard will not be sent out for external review.** The grant applications will be evaluated using the R21 evaluation shell (attached). One of the most effective ways to enhance research activity and productivity within the SVM is to increase the effectiveness of the limited intramural research funding currently available by using it to help acquire more extramural research dollars. In turn, acquisition of more extramural funding will enable more money to be placed into the pool of intramural research funds. The SVM Research Committee recognizes the future funding potential in awarding SVM intramural research dollars to disciplines for which there is a substantial amount of expertise within the School.

An original with 7 copies must be submitted to the Dean's office by COB Monday, June 18. The annual amount must be spent by June 30, 2007. The criteria by which we will rank these proposals (R21 evaluation shell) is also attached. Proposal review comments will be returned to the principal investigator. Any questions may be directed to the members of the SVM Research Committee.

cc: Peter F. Haynes, Interim Dean  
Thomas R. Klei, Associate Dean for Research and Advanced Studies

R21 evaluation shell

**Outline, followed by outline with explanations**

DESCRIPTION (Provided by applicant):

CRITIQUE:

Significance:

Approach:

Innovation:

Investigator:

Environment:

Overall Evaluation:

COMMITTEE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS:

**Outline with explanations**

RESUME AND SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

Do not write here. The LSU SVM Research committee will provide this following discussion of external review.

DESCRIPTION (Provided by applicant):

CRITIQUE: Do not write on this line.

In the sections below, make only evaluative comments, and include as little descriptive information as possible.

Reviewer #1: **or #2 or #3**

Significance: Does this study address an important problem? If the Aims of the application are achieved, how will scientific knowledge be advanced? What will be the effect of these studies on the concepts or methods that drive this field?

Approach: Are the conceptual framework, design [including composition of study population], methods, and analyses adequately developed, well-integrated, and appropriate to the Aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?

Innovation: Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches or methods? Are the Aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies?

Investigator: Are the investigator(s) appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the Principal Investigator and other researchers (if any)? PLEASE DO NOT INCLUDE descriptive biographical information unless important to the evaluation of merit.

Environment: Does the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Do the proposed experiments take advantage of unique features of the scientific environment or employ useful collaborative arrangements? Is there evidence of institutional support?

PLEASE DO NOT INCLUDE description of available facilities or equipment unless important to the evaluation of merit.

Note that for competing continuation (or amended) applications, comments on progress (or the response to the previous review) should be made either as a separate paragraph or and/or under the appropriate criteria above.

Overall Evaluation: In one brief paragraph, briefly summarize the most important points of the Critique, addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the application in terms of the five review criteria. Recommend a score reflecting the overall impact of the project on the field, weighting the review criteria, as the reviewer believes appropriate for each application. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have a major scientific impact and, thus, deserve a high merit rating. For example, an investigator may propose to carry out important work that by its nature is not innovative, but is essential to move a field forward.

COMMITTEE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS: All Reviewers will provide comments, the comments will be discussed at the meeting, and the final committee consensus will be described by the SRA after the meeting. Descriptions of the budget will ultimately be deleted; only changes from the proposed budget appear in the summary statement.

**The following three headings are only used if research with human subjects or samples is proposed.** Fewer than 10% of applications to the CMRC are involved. This information should be correctly provided in box 4 of the front page of the application. All reviewers should make brief comments as to acceptability. Please see the attached review criteria if necessary.

CLINICAL TRIAL: Yes or No?

GENDER CODE: G, 1 or 2 or 3 or 4, A or U ? Very brief rationale. This was judged to be scientifically (un) acceptable.

MINORITY CODE: M, 1 or 2 or 3 or 4, A or U ? Very brief rationale. This was judged to be scientifically (un) acceptable.

CHILDREN CODE: C, 1 or 2 or 3 or 4, A or U ? Very brief rationale. This was judged to be scientifically (un) acceptable.