



CFP Review processes

(Approved 7/30/2012)

Step 1: Proposal check-in and administrative review

Proposals received will be logged by the APPD LEARN Project Coordinator, assigned a proposal number, and reviewed for eligibility and compliance with the CFP requirements. If the proposal is not in compliance, the Project Coordinator will provide the investigators with direction on bringing it into compliance; if the investigators are not eligible, the Project Coordinator and APPD LEARN Director will contact the investigators to inform them.

Eligibility

Any APPD LEARN member program is eligible to submit a research proposal. APPD member programs that are not already APPD LEARN member programs must join APPD LEARN before or at the time of submission of a research proposal. Proposals may include collaborators who are not members of APPD LEARN, but an APPD LEARN member program must be the lead site for the proposal.

Proposals from APPD LEARN member programs may designate any affiliated faculty member(s) of any rank as project investigators, including principal investigator. However, all proposals must be approved by the PD and Department Head of the member program, and should be submitted by the program's APPD LEARN liaison. It is expected that the PD or Associate Program Director (APD) will be a co-investigator on proposals.

All studies that collect data through APPD LEARN are required to deposit their approved protocols and data into the APPD LEARN data repository in order to make them available to future investigators. Publications arising from APPD LEARN studies must acknowledge APPD LEARN, and their manuscripts must be submitted to APPD LEARN for archiving alongside the study data.

Format requirements (in brief, see CFP for details)

Single PDF file, all in 11 point Helvetica or Arial font, single-spaced, and with margins of at least 0.5 inches on all sides.

5-10 pages in length, not including face page or appendices. Face page (signed and scanned), specific aims (1 page), background and significance (2 pages), data collection (2 pages), programs and sample (2 pages), data analysis (2 pages), investigators (1 page), support obtained or needed (optional, 1 page). Appendices may include instruments, biosketches, and IRB approvals.

Step 2: PRC mail-in review

Criteria applied by the APPD LEARN PRC will include:

- Significance of the research question (including importance for Pediatric GME or medical education)
- Quality of the research plan (including study design, instrumentation, data analysis)
- Feasibility for APPD LEARN

Each proposal will be assigned a primary reviewer and at least two secondary reviewers. Reviewers will write narratives about each criterion and will assign each proposal an overall rating of excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor.

The Committee may make comments or suggest modifications to proposed studies to enhance any of these components.

Reviews can be submitted by email to the APPD LEARN Project Coordinator, who will compile them. A form for the review appears at the end of this document.

Step 3: PRC review meeting

The APPD LEARN project coordinator will compile the scores and narrative comments for each proposal. Proposals that receive at least one "G" score will be discussed by the PRC. The primary reviewer will briefly present their review, followed by the secondary reviewers. The goal of the discussion is for the PRC to assign each proposal to one of the following categories: Not Supportable; Not supportable but recommend revision; Supportable; High Priority. Within categories, the PRC may be asked to rank-order proposals.

Step 4: APPD LEARN Director decision

Committee recommendations are advisory. Final decisions about proposal approval or rejection will be made by the APPD LEARN Director. If the Director's decision differs from the committee's recommendation, the Director will so report to the committee and explain the reason.

APPD LEARN PRC Review Form

(Reviews need not be submitted on this form, but should include the elements below)

Proposal #	
Proposal title	
Proposal PI(s)	
Reviewer Name	
Reviewer Type (primary or secondary)	
Overall rating (E, VG, G, F, P)	

Review criteria: For each criterion, please provide a score for that criterion and write a narrative that explains the basis for the score. Narratives should first focus on the evaluation of the proposal as presented, and may then, at the reviewer's discretion, include suggestions for improvement.

Criterion 1: Significance of the research question (including importance for Pediatric GME or medical education).

Score (E, VG, G, F, P)	
Narrative evaluation	

Criterion 2: Quality of the research plan (including study design, instrumentation, data analysis)

Score (E, VG, G, F, P)	
Narrative evaluation	

Criterion 3: Feasibility for APPD LEARN (are sufficient resources available within APPD LEARN and from outside APPD LEARN to support this project)

Score (E, VG, G, F, P)	
Narrative evaluation	