Bioengineering Research Partnership Program Evaluation at the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute







Sixth Annual Bioengineering Research Partnership Grantees' Meeting July 13-14, 2006 Bethesda. Maryland



NHLBI BRP Evaluation Group

- Division of Heart and Vascular Disease
 - Tim Baldwin, Martha Lundberg, Sunil Pandit,
- Division of Lung Diseases
 - Andrea Harabin, Gail Weinmann
- Division of Blood Diseases and Resources
 - Pankaj Ganguly, Phyliss Mitchell
- Office of Science and Technology
 - Cheryl Howard, Carl Roth
- NIH BECON
 - Mike Huerta, Chris Kelley, Jeff Schloss, Dan Sullivan, Fei Wang
- Contractor: Humanitas, Inc.
 - Stephanie Karsten, April Smith, Maura Kephardt, Lynne Firester, Anne Wengrovitz



Purpose of Feasibility Study

- RATIONALE: Given both the costs and duration of the BRP PA, it is timely and important for the NIH to develop appropriate evaluation methodology.
- FY05 support about \$31.5M. However, despite the size and continued growth of the NIH-wide BRP program, little tracking and no systematic analysis has been conducted to determine whether the goals of the program are being met.



Specific Goals of the BRP Announcement

 Encourage basic, applied, and translational bioengineering research that could make a significant contribution to improving human health

 Encourage collaborations and partnerships among the allied quantitative and biomedical disciplines



Scope of Feasibility Study

- Specific Aims:
 - Evaluate, through information obtained from a small number of case studies and/or questionnaires of National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI)-awardees, the extent to which there are recognized standards of performance that could be used to assess success; and
 - Provide recommendations that will be useful to the NIH in administering the program.





Academic Disciplines of Lead BRP Awardee Investigators



Engineering/Physics and Medicine/Veterinary Medicine are the two most common academic disciplines reported by respondents in the online interviews and summarized in the case studies.



Conclusions

- Key metric: Are we increasing Collaborations?
- Need to strip away subjective bias with adequate Comparison Group: unfunded, but competitive applicants
 - Ask for Partnership information directly
 - Did they get funding elsewhere?
- Identify collaboration effort before and after the PA



Near-term Recommendations

- Emphasize reviewer orientation and training about the basic premise of the BRP Program for the proper peer-review of applications.
- Speed up renewals of funding to avoid delaying important research.
- Enhance cross-disciplinary research by identifying government health needs and organizing conferences to foster learning and new relationships.



Next Steps (I)

- Program participation approved through May 2007 receipt date: <u>http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PAR-06-</u> 459.html
- Focus Areas: <u>http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/funding/inits/brp-areas.htm</u>
- Further participation will require compelling evidence that mandates PAR continuance



Next Steps (II)

- Interim: sub-analysis (telephone interviews) to determine policy issues and guide effective decisions: what is the public health impact?
- Perform assessment of unfunded applications:
 - key personnel
 - IRG assignment
 - Type: hypothesis, design, or hybrid
 - Costs
- Determine if Full-scale evaluation is needed: September 2006

