

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS:

- Abstract (500 words or less) – describing the research
- Research Plan (4 pages excluding community engagement plan, timeline and references)
 - Specific aims
 - Significance (background)
 - Preliminary data
 - Approach
- Community Partners and engagement plan (1 page): Provide a narrative description of non-academic, community partners making clear why the partner(s) are appropriate for the proposed project. Summarize how you will partner with identified community organizations to execute the proposed research plan. There must be **value added** for all members of the partnership, including representation of local community partners affected by HIV. It is important to make clear how your project includes **communication** and **collaboration** between all partners in all phases of the project including: 1) planning/development, 2) initiation, 3) execution, and 4) dissemination. Please refer to the core principles of community engagement in forming your engagement plan (https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/communityengagement/pdf/PCE_Report_508_FINAL.pdf - Pg. 43-53)
- Timeline
- References
- Biosketches
- Letters of support –Include a Letter of Support from all partnering community organizations. That letter should make clear the following things from the community partner perspective:
 - The partner’s interest in the project and how they see the grant benefiting their organization or mission
 - A summary of the engagement plan from the community partner perspective and assurance that the partnership is functional and that it benefits the community partner
 - A statement of how the partner envisions being involved in future ending the epidemic projects and grants.

TERMS OF AWARD

- Amount of funding – up to \$40k/award
- 12-month timeline with requests for 6-month NCE
- Funds may be used for salary and fringe benefits of junior faculty and laboratory personnel and research-related supplies, no funds for mentor salary, equipment (including computers), domestic travel or indirects (F&A). There is no requirement that a given percentage of funds be directed

REVIEW PROCESS – The CFAR Community-Engaged Research Council (C-CERC) and members of the leadership of the CFAR will hold a special review panel to review Community-Engaged Grants to End the HIV Epidemic Awards. The review will follow the same structure as an NIH scientific review panel, with time devoted to discussion of the nature of community partnership and engagement. C-CERC and CFAR leadership will all provide scores for grants, which will have equal weight in funding decisions.

REVIEW CRITERIA

Significance: Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? Does the project effectively employ an academic-community partnership to achieve its aims? 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? Will successful completion of the project provide the basis for future NIH funding? Does the proposal address the [NIH HIV/AIDS Research Priorities?](#)

Investigator(s): Is there adequate representation from the community-based partner and is there a multi-PI from the community? Are the PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well-suited to the project, and will their collaboration

be likely to generate significant insights? If Early-Stage Investigators or New Investigators, or in the early stages of independent careers, do they have appropriate experience and training? Has the PI previously received funding for a related project? If the project is collaborative, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise? How will the award further the applicant's career development?

Innovation: Does the application advance the field of community-engaged research? Does the project 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 methodologies, 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?

Approach: Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analysis well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Does the project incorporate the basic principles of community-engaged participatory research (CBPR) and does the proposal make a strong argument for how those principles will enhance the approach? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility and will particularly risky aspects be managed? If the project involves clinical research are the plans for protection of human subjects from research risks included.

Community engagement plan: Does the proposal include a clear and feasible plan for ensuring partnership with community and bidirectional flow of information and needs? Is the community organization engaged with the work as a true partner? Or is the community organization functioning primarily as a venue for accessing participants? Was the community partner involved in study design and proposal development? Is there an explicit plan for sharing findings with the community?