Fellowship review..... behind the scenes at the NIH (or AHA, etc.)

Carol Lutz, PhD Associate Dean for Student Affairs SGS, RBHS-New Jersey Medical School <u>lutzcs@njms.rutgers.edu</u>

Fall 2022



Fellowships are training vehicles. Science is really important, but the "training potential" of your experience is just as important

Look now for upcoming opportunities!

What else gets scored, other than the science?

- *Applicant *Mentor/co-mentor
- *Training plan/potential for training relevant to articulated career path *Environment



Fellowship Applications...how to get started

- Look for opportunities in your area of research
- Some local/regional (NJCCR, NJ Spinal Cord Institute, etc.)
- Some from professional societies (AAI, etc.)
- **NSF, NIH, etc.
- Other agencies, AHA, etc.
- GradFund

So you've submitted your fellowship application. What happens next?

- Proposal gets assigned to a group based on subject matter
- Next assigned to a subgroup or subsection
- Scientific Review Officer (PhD) is tasked with organization of a "study section" or grant review panel
- He/she will assign applications to reviewers based on their expertise



Reviewers must be:

- Knowledgeable/subject expert
- Impartial, unemotional
- Fair
- Objective
- Accurate
- Critical, logical
- Reliable
- Able to write a helpful, readable review
- Able to assess "novelty"



Study Section Logistics

- Reviewers will have ~ 10-12 applications to read and write reviews
- Will have ~ 4-6 weeks to do so
- Will meet in person or via teleconference
- Each application has 3 reviewers: R1, R2, R3
- Applications are scored by all. Review panel does not determine fundability, only scoring



Only ~50% of applications will be "discussed." Those applications with non-competitive scores will receive full written reviews, but will not be discussed

in order to allow more time for discussion of the competitively scored applications.



SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA Fellowship Applications (F30, F31, F32)

REVIEW CRITERIA (Provide Criterion Score for each)	ADDITIONAL REVIEW CRITERIA
1. Fellowship Applicant	Factored into overall Impact score (Don't
2. Sponsors, Collaborators, &	<u>get</u> separate scores)
Consultants	1. Human Subjects
3. Research Training Plan	2. Vertebrate Animals
4. Training Potential	3. Biohazards
5. Institutional Environment &	4. Resubmission (for A1 applications)

Overall Impact

Commitment to Training

2

3

5

- Overall Impact score is NOT an average of Individual criterion scores.
- It is a separate assessment of the likelihood of the fellowship to promote candidate's potential for, and commitment to, an independent scientific research career, in consideration of the scored and additional review criteria.

MERIT Assessment	IMPACT on candidate's research training and career development	SCORE
	HIGH	1
Overall research	No weaknesses or negligible weakness that will not affect training	2
training VALUE of the application	that will not anoot training	3
	MEDIUM	4
	A good application with some minor weaknesses	5
		6
	LOW	7
	Applications with moderate weakness	8
		9

Overall Impact Score Guidelines Training Value and its Impact on applicant's training and development

FELLOWSHIPS & CAREER AWARDS

Overall Impact:

The likelihood that the proposed training (F) or career development (K) will enhance the candidate's potential for a productive, independent scientific research career in a health-related field.

Overall Impact	High	Medium	Low
Score	123	456	789

					-
	Evaluating Overall Impact Consider the 5 criteria (weighting based on reviewer's judgment): Fs Ks		e.g. Proposes training or career development of high value/benefit for the candidate who has high potential for	e.g. Proposes training or career development of high or moderate value/benefit for the candidate who has high or moderate potential	e.g. Proposes training or career development of moderate or low value/benefit for the candidate who has
	 Applicant Sponsor(s) Research Training Plan Training 	 Candidate Career Development Plan/Goals* Research Plan 	developing into a productive, independent scientist. May have some or no weaknesses in the	for further development, but weaknesses in the criteria reduce the overall impact to medium.	moderate or low potential for further development. Weaknesses in the criteria reduce the overall impact to low.
	Potential • Institutional Environment & Commitment	Mentor(s)** Environment & Institutional Commitment	criteria.	e.g. Proposes training or career development of moderate value/benefit for the candidate who shows moderate potential. May	e.g. Proposes training or career development of low value/benefit for the candidate who shows low
	and other score in human subjects, inclusion plans, a	animal welfare,		have some weaknesses in the criteria.	potential. May have some weaknesses in the criteria.
*K05 and K24: Plan to Provide Mentoring **K02: Consultants/Collaborators		5 is a good, mediun should always be c	n-impact application. The e	entire scale (1-9)	

Fellowship Review Focus Summary

- The review should focus on the training VALUE of the application and its IMPACT on applicant's scientific development
 - ✓ the applicant's potential for an independent, scientific research career
 - ✓ the applicant's need for the proposed training
 - ✓ the sponsor's training experience, funding, and commitment
 - ✓ the level of integration of the Research and Training Plans to provide productive research training
 - ✓ the quality of the research environment (Scientific programs, facilities)
 - ✓ Overall Impact Score Decision: the potential of the application to promote scientific development and prepare the candidate for research independence

Questions?

lutzcs@njms.rutgers.edu