

4. Environment

The extent to which the applicant and proposed collaborators have documented:

- a. Their history and current capacity to provide a leadership function in convening and facilitating the work of the coalition.
- b. Their history and current capacity to provide a leadership function in the tailoring, implementation, and evaluation of the selected community-based interventions to reduce motor vehicle-related injuries.
- c. Their history and current capacity to present findings at national conferences and prepare peer-reviewed manuscripts.
- d. A willingness to attend and participate in technical assistance and planning meetings and related travel to Atlanta coordinated by the CDC for all cooperative agreement recipients.
- e. Their organizational capacity to realize the objectives of the cooperative agreement.
- f. Their management operation, structure and/or organization. An organizational chart of the applicant's organization should be included as an appendix. Additionally, the applicant should include within their management plan the specific role and mechanisms to be established to ensure effective coordination, communication and shared decision making among the involved agencies/organizations.
- g. A staffing plan for the project, noting existing staff as well as additional staffing needs. The responsibilities of individual staff members including the level of effort and allocation of time for each project activity by staff position should be included. The specific staff positions within the other involved state level agencies, both in-kind and funded, should be described.
- h. Resumes, biosketches, and/or position descriptions (*i.e.* for current staff, in-kind, and proposed positions to be funded under this cooperative agreement) should be included as an appendix. This should include the use of consultants, as appropriate.
- i. A continuation plan in the event that key staff leave the project, how new staff will be smoothly integrated into the project, and assurances that resources will be available when needed for this project.
- j. Previous experience of project staff to submit required reports on time.

5. Ethical Issues

What provisions have been made for the protection of human subjects and the safety of the research environments?

How does the applicant plan to handle issues of confidentiality and compliance with mandated reporting requirements, (e.g., suspected child abuse)? Does the application adequately address the requirements of 45 CFR part 46 for the protection of human subjects? (An application can be disapproved if the research risks are sufficiently serious and protection against risks is so inadequate as to make the entire application unacceptable.) The degree to which the applicant has met the CDC Policy requirements regarding the inclusion of women, ethnic, and racial groups in the proposed research. This includes:

- a. The proposed plan for the inclusion of both sexes and racial and ethnic minority populations for appropriate representation.
- b. The proposed justification when representation is limited or absent.
- c. A statement as to whether the design of the study is adequate to measure differences when warranted.
- d. A statement as to whether the plans for recruitment and outreach for study participants include the process of establishing partnerships with communities and recognition of mutual benefits. Is there evidence of effective working relationships between the applicant and community organizations? Does the applicant describe experience in developing community partnerships and the community's current and anticipated capacity to carry out the proposed activities?

6. Study Samples

Are the samples rigorously defined to permit complete independent replication at another site? Have the referral sources been described, including the definitions and criteria? What plans have been made to include women and minorities and their subgroups as appropriate for the scientific goals of the research? How will the applicant deal with recruitment and retention of subjects?

7. Dissemination

- a. Plans to present findings to local, state, regional, and national audiences.
- b. Plans to prepare peer-reviewed manuscripts based on the study.

8. Measures of Effectiveness

Are the measures set forth in the application in accordance with CDC's performance plans? How adequately has the applicant addressed these measures?

The SEP will also examine the appropriateness of the proposed study budget and duration in relation to the

proposed research and the availability of data required for the study.

The secondary review will be conducted by the Science and Program Review Subcommittee (SPRS) of the Advisory Committee for Injury Prevention and Control (ACIPC). ACIPC Federal agency experts will be invited to attend the secondary review and will receive modified briefing books (*i.e.*, abstracts, strengths and weaknesses from summary statements, and project officer's briefing materials). ACIPC Federal agency experts will be encouraged to participate in deliberations when applications address overlapping areas of research interest so that unwarranted duplication in federally funded research can be avoided and special subject area expertise can be shared. The NCIPC Division Associate Directors for Science (ADS) or their designees will attend the secondary review in a similar capacity as the ACIPC Federal agency experts to assure that research priorities of the announcement are understood and to provide background regarding current research activities. Only SPRS members will vote on funding recommendations, and their recommendations will be carried to the entire ACIPC for voting by the ACIPC members in closed session. If any further review is needed by the ACIPC, regarding the recommendations of the SPRS, the factors considered will be the same as those considered by the SPRS.

The subcommittee's responsibility is to develop funding recommendations for the NCIPC Director based on the results of the primary review, the relevance and balance of proposed research relative to the NCIPC programs and priorities, and to assure that unwarranted duplication of federally funded research does not occur. The secondary review committee has the latitude to recommend to the NCIPC Director, to reach over better ranked proposals in order to assure maximal impact and balance of proposed research. The factors to be considered will include:

1. The results of the primary review including the application's priority score as the primary factor in the selection process.
2. The relevance and balance of proposed research relative to the NCIPC programs and priorities.
3. The significance of the proposed activities in relation to the priorities and objectives stated in Healthy People 2010, the Institute of Medicine report, Reducing the Burden of Injury, and the NCIPC Injury Research Agenda.
4. Budgetary considerations including the extent to which the budget is