Community Engaged Research (CEnR) Seed Award Program: Stroke Rehabilitation Focus Request for Proposals
ABOUT THIS SEED GRANT PROGRAM

The Stroke Rehabilitation Center of Southeastern Wisconsin (SRC) is a collaborative research initiative between The Medical College of Wisconsin and Marquette University and is supported by the Advancing a Healthier Wisconsin Research and Education Program (AHW REP).

For the 2020 cycle, the SRC is set to fund one award of up to 12-months and up to $25,000. This award is intended to stimulate academic and community partnerships in community engaged research (CEnR) in stroke rehabilitation.

The SRC’s mission is to improve functional outcomes for stroke survivors in southeast Wisconsin and beyond through cutting-edge research, excellence in healthcare delivery, rigorous training of the next generation of researchers and clinicians and engaging the community to eliminate disparities in health outcomes. More information about the SRC can be found at:

The SRC has created the CEnR Seed Award program to increase multidisciplinary collaborations to improve the translational impact of stroke rehabilitation at the population/community level. By promoting and encouraging the CEnR approach, the SRC aims to develop a platform for investigators from different areas of emphasis to work together to improve functional outcomes for stroke survivors in southeast Wisconsin and beyond.

For this grant cycle, all projects must select a research topic related to stroke rehabilitation. Projects must include a community partner. Teams of interdisciplinary investigators with community partners will conduct research studies and/or activities focused on building the foundation for a strong community engagement project that is innovative, collaborative and translational.

Ideal projects will:

❖ Support promising research that directly or indirectly impacts the functional outcomes of stroke survivors in Southeastern Wisconsin;

❖ Lead to improved public understanding of stroke rehabilitation research;

❖ Produce strategies for promoting collaborative and innovative partnerships between scientific researchers, clinical investigators and the community;
Identify specific challenges to optimizing functional outcomes for stroke survivors, develop unique solutions, create intellectual property, and/or improve community health outcomes;

Demonstrate clear relevance and importance to the communities involved in the project;

Use concrete community engagement methods throughout each phase of the project and, where appropriate, advance understanding about how community engagement can be done in complex research settings;

Encourage sustainable, authentic community-academic partnerships and display genuine collaboration among academic and community co-PIs in all areas of the research design and implementation; and

Outline a plan for disseminating research findings and continuing the research beyond the seed grant, including how what is learned (outcomes) will be used to seek external funding (e.g. NIH, foundation or other).

ABOUT THE FUNDING SOURCES

The Advancing a Healthier Wisconsin (AHW) Endowment, stewarded by the Medical College of Wisconsin (MCW), works with partners to serve as a catalyst for positive change in the health of Wisconsin communities.

BUDGET AND TIMEFRAME

Funding requests should not exceed a total of $25,000 over a maximum of a 12-month period. Note that no-cost extensions will not be granted. In this cycle, the SRC will fund up to 1 proposal. To be considered for funding, all proposals must adhere to the grants schedule listed below.

II. SEED GRANT PROGRAM SPECIFICS

ELIGIBILITY

Applicants are required to identify two co-principal investigators (co-PIs), one from each of the following categories:

1) Wisconsin-based community organization

   For the purpose of this RFP, defined as a non-profit, 501(c)(3) tax exempt organization or a government organization, including:

   - health, social service, and other community-based organizations;
❖ faith-based organizations;
❖ state and local governments;
❖ scientific or professional associations, universities, schools;
❖ voluntary associations, foundations, civic and citizen groups; and,
❖ federally-recognized Indian tribal governments, tribes, or tribal organizations. **AND**

2) **MCW Faculty Researcher**

All faculty PIs must have full-time or full professional effort status at MCW to be eligible to serve as principal investigators (PIs). Adjunct and part-time faculty are not eligible to apply as a PI. Untenured junior investigators are encouraged to apply.

According to MCW corporate policy, the MCW PI will be primarily responsible for ensuring compliance with the scientific, safety, and ethical responsibilities of the grant award. The MCW PI will have the additional expectation of managing the award through the MCW internal eBridge system and through their department. The MCW PI will be responsible for all grant reporting and fiscal management and will be the main contact for budget and reporting management.

**BUDGET GUIDELINES**

❖ For budgetary purposes, a single MCW full-time, full professional effort faculty member must be designated as the primary awardee (the PI).

❖ Faculty salary must abide by **the FY15 Executive Level II ($183,300) salary cap**. The “request for salary cap” function needs be requested in eBridge during the pre-submission state prior to submitting your proposal to the Sponsor for review.

❖ If the % effort on the grant does not match the salary requested, a **cost-sharing form** must be completed before funds can be dispersed.

❖ All personnel support must be justified, and their specific project roles outlined in the budget justification during the full proposal stage.

❖ AHW funding cannot be used as “bridge funding” for lapsed grants from any extramural source and is intended to be used for new projects.

**ALLOWABLE EXPENSES**

AHW Funds can only be used for **direct project-specific expenses**. Direct costs must be identified in the application proposal. Costs that have NOT been identified and approved through the application process must be requested as a re-budget prior to being incurred or the cost is considered unallowable.

Examples of eligible expenses include:

❖ Salary and benefits for personnel directly involved in the project
❖ Direct expenses including, but not limited to, supplies, equipment, travel, mileage, etc.

**FUNDING RESTRICTIONS**
Please review the detailed list of Direct, Indirect, and Unallowable Costs available at the AHW Endowment Website.

Funds may not be used for:
- Indirect costs, such as ongoing operating expenses of routine functions and principal programs
- Entertainment or alcoholic beverages
- Lobbying
- Stipends (please note that participant incentives are allowed)
- Reimbursement solely for patient care or clinical service delivery
- Supplanting (see Supplanting Criteria below)

SUPPLANTING CRITERIA

The March 28, 2000 Order of the Commissioner of Insurance requires that the AHW Endowment funds (the Funds) “may not be used to supplant funds or resources that are available from other sources.” The MCW Consortium is required to report annually on “whether the Funds are supplanting resources otherwise available.” MCW must report annually the basis for the “determination that the application of the Funds does not supplant other resources that may be available to accomplish the same purposes.”

Applicants are required to complete and submit the AHW Non-Supplanting Attestation form as part of the application process.

III. APPLICATION PROCESS

PRE-PROPOSAL REQUIREMENT

Interested applicants are required to meet with the SRC’s Community Academic Advisory Board for this funding opportunity. Please contact Moriah Iverson at miverson@mcw.edu to coordinate.

FULL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

A link to the online application system (REDCap) where the full proposal needs to be submitted will be sent via email after meeting with the CAAB. We strongly encourage collaboration on the process of proposal writing between the community and academic co-PIs.

An awarded application must be routed through eBridge.
FULL PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

To be considered for funding, the full proposal must include the following:

1. **Cover Page with Abstract**: Please use the template included in the application system. Abstract maximum is 300 words.

2. **Narrative** (6 pages maximum*, single-spaced, PDF) to include:
   - **Specific Aims**: What is your research question? What are the hypotheses or research goals?
   - **Background and Significance**: What health issue will be addressed? What gap in knowledge will your project address? Describe any relevant experience you have in understanding or studying the proposed cardiovascular health issue. In what zip codes will this project be conducted? Describe how this research project got started. Explain why this topic is relevant to the community where the research will be conducted.
   - **Community**: Describe your community engagement process. How are community stakeholders affected by your project? How will community stakeholders be involved in project design and implementation, and dissemination of findings? How will the community benefit from the result of your project? Who will benefit? How will the anticipated results of your project help to improve the health of people in the community?
   - **SRC’s Mission**: How does this project relate to the overall mission of the SRC, which is to improve functional outcomes for stroke survivors in southeast Wisconsin and beyond through cutting-edge research, cost-efficient and high-quality healthcare delivery, rigorous training of the next generation of stroke rehabilitation clinicians and scientists, and engaging the community to eliminate disparities in health outcomes?
   - **Partnership**: Describe your partnership. Show how the community and academic partners have relevant and meaningful roles on the project and can fulfill their research collaboratively. If this is a new partnership, describe how the partnership started and how each member became involved in this project. Why is the partnership necessary to achieve the goals of this project?
   - **Project Design and Methods**: What type of research project is this (e.g. cross-sectional, longitudinal; survey; bio-specimen, etc.)? What research methods will you use and how is the proposed method suited for this project? What are the outcomes and processes being measured? How will data be collected and analyzed? Describe study participant recruitment, if applicable. Address any human
subject protections issues and potential risk to study participants, including plan for IRB submission.

- **Next Steps:** Describe your dissemination plan. How do you intend to disseminate your pilot project findings to both academic and community audiences? How will the results of this study be used to continue this line of research, including potential for securing subsequent, extramural funding? How will community efforts and benefits on this project be sustained?

- **Literature Cited (not included in page limit)**

3. **Activities Timeline:** Please provide an overview of activities by quarter, not to exceed 12 months. Please use the template included in the application system.

4. **Biosketches, Resumes, or CVs:** Allowance of one document per investigator, limit of 5 pages per document in Word Doc or PDF format.

5. **Budget & Budget Justification:** Templates are included in the application system. Separate budget justifications must be completed by MCW PI and community co-PI. Additional Instructions are included on the templates.

6. **Letters of Commitment:** Please provide letters of support from community or MCW stakeholders. Letters should describe specific details of collaboration, commitment, or support. Upload to application system as PDF document(s). Maximum of three letters allowed.

7. **Signed Non-Supplanting Attestation Form:** The PI, all co-Investigators, any partnering organizations, and any additional investigators named on the project are required to complete and submit an AHW NonSupplanting Attestation Form. For more information, please see page 5 of this RFP.

8. **Cost-Sharing Form** (if applicable): MCW faculty whose % effort does not match their salary requests on the budget must submit a completed cost-sharing form before funds will be dispersed.

*Please note: The six-page limit applies only to the narrative portion of the application and does not include the following: Cover Page, Literature Cited, Activities Timeline, Biosketches/Resumes, Budget and Budget Justification, Letters of Commitment, Non-Supplanting Attestation Form, and Cost-Sharing Form (if applicable).*
REVIEW PROCESS

A review committee of representatives from both the local community and MCW will review using the 9-point rating scale drawn from the National Institutes of Health and will provide recommendations for funding to the governing committee.

All applications will be scored based on the following criteria:

❖ **Community Impact:** Does the project demonstrate community engagement or collaboration in how it addresses the health issue or disparity of importance to a community in Milwaukee? Does the project show the potential to lead to a longer-term research or evaluation project, including additional funding, which may ultimately lead to advances/best practices that contribute to health improvements in the community?

❖ **Scientific Significance:** Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? Does the project have a clear and focused research question with aim(s), hypotheses, and measurable objectives? Is there a strong scientific premise for the project? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

❖ **Rigor and Transparency:** Does the application discuss the strengths and weaknesses of prior research used to support the application? Does the proposal address weaknesses or gaps identified in the proposal? Is the scientific premise of the project adequately described? Are experimental controls, plans to reduce bias, power analyses, and statistical methods fully described? Is there an adequate justification for biological variables (such as sex, age, weight, underlying health conditions, etc.)? If existing guidelines or standards for authentications of a resource exist, is this adequately described?

❖ **Investigator(s):** Are the PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well-suited to the project? If Early Stage Investigators or New Investigators, or in the early stages of independent careers, do they have appropriate experience and training? If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? Do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance and organizational structure appropriate for the project?

❖ **SRC’s Research Priorities:** How well does this proposal align with one of the special emphasis areas? How well does the proposal align with the SRC’s mission?

❖ **Innovation:** Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are the concepts, approaches or methods, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or
interventions proposed? Does the approach target a community level issue that has not been well addressed in prior research?

❖ **Approach & Feasibility:** Are the overall strategy, methods, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Have the investigators presented strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach, as appropriate for the work proposed? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project involves clinical research, are the plans for 1) protection of human subjects from research risks, and 2) inclusion of minorities and members of both sexes/genders, as well as the inclusion of children, justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed? Does the community partner have the capacity to perform this research; are they prepared to recruit the number of participants specified? Does the community partner have appropriately trained staff to perform this work?

❖ **Leveraging:** What is the likelihood that this proposal’s early-stage research will lead to future extramural grant funding? Will the findings/data produced from the proposed research result in long-term programs, products, or information that are helpful to the community?

❖ **Environment:** Will the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Are the institutional support, equipment and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed? Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements? Does the community co-PI have adequate buy-in from the non-profit’s leadership to perform this work? Does the community non-profit have a history of supporting and effectively performing community engaged research? Does the community non-profit have adequate equipment and technology to perform this work (e.g. access to computers, internet, staff trained on data entry tasks, staff with CITI training, etc.)?

❖ **Community Collaboration:** Are the roles of the partners appropriate and relevant? Does this project enhance collaboration among entities with similar or complementary goals? Is there clear evidence that the community was involved in identifying the health issues and study methods? Does the project outline a plan that shows genuine collaboration between the community and the academic researchers in all aspects of design, implementation, and dissemination? Is the organization respected and valued by the target population? Is the project culturally competent?

❖ **Budget and Timeline:** Is the requested budget appropriate for this project? Is the proposed timeline feasible and attainable for this project?

---

**POST-AWARD REQUIREMENTS**

This grant program requires the following post-award expectations:

❖ Acquire required regulatory approvals (supplanting review, IRB/IACUC/IBC, etc.). Funds will be available after approvals have been acquired.
❖ Comply with all HIPPA requirements
❖ Submit Cost-Sharing Forms for MCW faculty if applicable (if not submitted with the initial application)
❖ MCW PI must become a Stroke Rehabilitation Center Member (if not already):
  ❖ Key personnel will be required to present an oral presentation to the SRC Community Academic Advisory Board and SRC Leadership Committee.
❖ Submit a 6-month progress report including description of work accomplished and related budget expenditures
❖ Submit a final report within 30 days of project’s end including project results, lessons learned, any publications and extramural funding applications applied for and/or received, and next steps
❖ Submit a draft of preliminary specific aims for a NIH, or other extramural application based on this project
❖ Respond to annual requests for project results and outcomes information for up to five years after the grant period ends

DEFINITIONS

Community: 1. a group of individuals organized into a unit or manifesting some unifying trait or common interest; (Institute of Medicine, 2003). 2. community need not be defined solely by geography. It can refer to a group that self-identifies by age, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, special interest, faith, life experience, disability, illness, or health condition. It can refer to a common interest or cause, a sense of identification or shared emotional connection, shared values or norms, mutual influence, common interest, or commitment to meeting a shared need. (CCPH Board of Directors, 2005)

Community Engagement: “the process of working collaboratively with and through groups of people affiliated by geographic proximity, special interest, or similar situations to address issues affecting the well-being of those people. It is a powerful vehicle for bringing about environmental and behavioral change that will improve the health of the community and its members. It often involves partnerships and coalitions that help mobilize resources and influence systems, change relationships among partners, and serve as catalysts for changing policies, programs, and practices.” (Center for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 1997, p. 9)

Community Engaged Research/Community Engagement in Research (CEnR): CEnR is a process of inclusive participation that supports mutual respect of values, strategies, and actions for authentic partnership of people affiliated with or self-identified by geographic proximity, special interest, or similar situations to address issues affecting the well-being of the community of focus. (Ahmed & Palermo, 2008)

Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR): a collaborative approach to research that equitably involves all partners in the research process and recognizes the unique strengths that each brings. CBPR begins with a research topic of importance to the
community and has the aim of combining knowledge with action and achieving social change. (W.K. Kellogg Community Health Scholars Program, 2001)

**Community Outreach:** the ways faculty, staff, and students collaborate with external groups in mutually beneficial partnerships that are grounded in scholarship and consistent with the role and mission of their professional appointment. (Adapted from CU-Boulder Council of Deans, February 16, 2010; [http://outreach.colorado.edu/about/outreach-definition](http://outreach.colorado.edu/about/outreach-definition))

**Community Service:** is co-curricular or extra-curricular—it's something you do apart from or in addition to your academic or professional duties. You may enjoy helping others and want to volunteer in the local community on your own. (Adapted from [http://www.eiu.edu/volunteer/defservice.php](http://www.eiu.edu/volunteer/defservice.php))

**Community partner:** for the purpose of this RFP, defined as a non-profit, 501(c)(3) tax exempt organization or a government organization, including:
- health, social service, and other community-based organizations;
- faith-based organizations;
- state and local governments;
- scientific or professional associations, universities, schools;
- voluntary associations, foundations, civic and citizen groups; and,
- federally-recognized Indian tribal governments, tribes, or tribal organizations.

From Advancing a Healthier Wisconsin [http://www.mcw.edu/Advancing-Healthier-WI-Endowment/Apply-for-Funding/HWPP/Application-Resources.htm](http://www.mcw.edu/Advancing-Healthier-WI-Endowment/Apply-for-Funding/HWPP/Application-Resources.htm)

**PROGRAM STAFF**
- Moriah Iverson, MS
  miverson@mcw.edu