



## THE CMBB QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER

Issue 7, July 2000

**CMBB STAFF:**  
**Sanya Springfield, Ph.D., Chief**  
**Eric Bailey, Ph.D., M.P.H., Program Director**  
**Lawrence Alfred, Ph.D., Program Director**  
**Ms. Bobby Rosenfeld, Senior Program Analyst**  
**Ms. LaShell Gaskins, Secretary**

### MENTORING AND PEER REVIEW WORKSHOP

Once again, thanks to our speakers, participants, and staff, our annual workshop for our postdoctoral, junior faculty and career development awardees was a rousing success.

We would like to take this opportunity to apologize to those of you that either did not receive invitations or who received invitations late.

**To those of you that missed the workshop, here's what you missed.**

**Mr. Walter Gardipee**, an undergraduate supplement recipient, and his mentor, **Dr. Howard Beall (University of Montana)**; **Ms. Malaika Woods**, a graduate supplement recipient, and her mentor, **Dr. Jasjit Ahluwalia (Kansas University Medical Center)**; **Dr. Arthur Davis**, a postdoctoral supplement recipient, and his mentor, **Dr. Bernard Weissman (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill)**, and **Dr. Marta Torroella**, a junior faculty supplement recipient, and her mentor, **Dr. Diana Lopez (University of Miami)**. Their presentations on "The Nature of Mentoring Relationships at Key Stages of Professional Development" were enlightening and heartfelt

and very well received and appreciated by all of the workshop participants. They know what it takes to mentor and what it takes to be mentored.

The last day of our workshop we devote to our K01 grantees and the peer review process. As a condition of their grants, they must attend two mock study sessions to prepare them to be reviewers at regular review meetings. These mock sessions are handled in the same way as any other review meeting; the applications are assigned to primary and secondary reviewers, critiques are written and presented at the meetings, discussions take place and each application is given a priority score. After each discussion, the reviews are compared to the "real" review, and not surprising, the two are almost always identical.

However, in order to continue this practice, we need some R01 grants that have already been reviewed to use in our mock sessions. To do this, of course, the PI must give permission for that grant to be used. So, we need some of you to send us copies of your peer reviewed R01s to use as samples. If you have any questions, just give us a call. Thanks in advance for your help.

Another special thank you to **Dr. Cecilia Whitacre (Case Western Reserve University)**,

one of our first Mentored Career Development Awardees, for her warm and thoughtful talk about "What it Takes to Succeed in Cancer Research." Dr. Whitaker shared some of her experiences that led to her successfully competing for the K01 grant and her presentation was greeted with a great deal of enthusiasm. Thanks, Cecilia.

We would also like to give a big round of applause to **Ms. Bobby Rosenfeld**, this year's co-chair and to our secretary, **Ms. LaShell Gaskins**, without whom we would not have been as prepared as we were. And, of course, our contractors, SCG, Inc., particularly **Ms. Shirley Banks** and **Ms. Tricia Wallich** for making sure that everything ran smoothly.

We would like to share with all of you some of the responses we've received from some of our participants. Here are their impressions:

**Carmen Kelly (Karmanos Cancer Center)**, writes: "I want to thank you again for the Peer Review Meeting. It was very informative and very helpful for my future plans. Everything was first class: the speakers, the topics, the food and the atmosphere. I truly appreciate all the work that you and your staff put into it.

I came back energized. At the moment I am reviewing all my options and getting my ideas together for a Grant proposal. I will be in touch with you soon. Wishing you success is all your projects."

From **Kevin Walker (Washington State University)**: "I came to the Mentor and Peer Review Workshop knowing absolutely nothing about the categorization of the various grants and the totality of the application process. However, after listening to the selected speakers and talking with various attendant colleagues, I not only got information on the various types of awards and about which award I currently held, but also learned about which grant I should vie for next.

My overall impression of the Workshop was excellent; the opening day was thorough in explaining the many alternatives for research funding. My personal highlights include, but are not limited to, the NIH campus tours, the short sessions with the NIH scientists, and the mock review session. While the latter session required the "reviewers" to read only a few proposals, this exercise, however, gave insight

into a very integral, pertinent part of the grant application process.

In closing, I thank all of the coordinators and speakers, particularly Dr. Sanya Springfield and her entourage for their relentless enthusiasm over the duration of the meeting. The candid discussion about "what it takes to get funded" and "how to set one's self apart" was well received by all attending. I recommend this four day workshop to all underrepresented science candidates. I plan to attend next year!"

**Yuda Shayo (University of Texas, Austin)** writes: "I am writing to extend my appreciation to you as well as all in your team for the opportunity you afforded us to learn about the funding opportunities available for cancer research.

I thank you in advance and wish you all the best in your endeavors."

From **Elena Martinez (Arizona Cancer Center)**: "Hope you recovered from the activities. I imagine there is no rest for you and your staff given this week's activities (the MI/CCP TAW) in New Orleans.

I wanted to thank you, Bobby, and everyone else who had anything to do with the workshop in Gaithersburg. I feel very fortunate to be part of the CURE.

And from **Miguel Berrios (SUNY, Stony Brook)**: "It was nice seeing you and your group last week. The Workshop's size and the amount of information given to participants has grown considerably since I was an attendee last (at the very first Workshop).

Although all talks were excellent, those by Kimes, Bailey, Rosenfeld, Alfred, Kalt and Bell were the most informative to me. I thought that the last day's exercise (study sections) was perhaps the most important addition to the Workshop. I am certain it was of great benefit for me and those attending. I only wish I have

had this opportunity after graduate school. It would have had a profound impact on my career development.

I wish to thank you for your enthusiasm and

tireless efforts on our behalf. I feel that the best retribution for your work would be for us to concentrate efforts in joining the "mainstream" and by doing so increase our dismal representation at study sections.

Please give my thanks to Bobby and the SCG's staff for helping organize such a successful Workshop."

**Telih Boyiri (American Health Foundation)** writes "Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to participate in the Mentoring and Peer Review Workshop.

The Workshop was very informative and has prepared me to write and submit a competitive cancer research grant. I also enjoyed networking among peers and the NCI Program Directors.

Thank you again for an excellent workshop."

**Dr. Jasjit Ahluwalia (Kansas University Medical Center)**, one of our wonderful mentors and speakers writes "Thank you so much for inviting me to speak at the CMBB annual meeting. It would be my pleasure to speak every year! (I love talking...!) It was also so nice to finally meet you and Bobby; you both have been so helpful.

P.S. I love the "logo" for the meeting (on the bags and posters..)"

From **Marta Torroella (University of Miami)**: "Three weeks have passed since the Mentoring and Peer Review Workshop was held in Gaithersburg. This was an outstanding meeting from all points of view, and I want to congratulate you and your collaborators for the excellent job done. We are fortunate to have someone like you as the head of the Minority Program at the NCI, so committed, convinced and devoted to the idea of developing a space so that we, minorities, can start our own research projects with a special oxygen supply. We are also privileged to count on people as your collaborators, efficient, friendly and enthusiastic persons such as Bobby, Eric and Dr. Alfred. I want you to know how encouraged I feel after this meeting, and how stimulated I am to continue fighting in this competitive field of research with the informational tools that you provided us. Before coming to the workshop, I

had a very general and superficial vision of the grant opportunities that existed, and personally, I felt that the RO1 was an unreachable possibility for me. Today, after assisting to this meeting, I feel confident in the fact that working hard and following the guidelines and steps that you have provided us under the CURE program, there is no way that we will not be able to succeed in our goal of establishing ourselves as successful researchers.

I believe the workshop was excellent, exquisitely well organized from its general objectives to the simplest details. The selection of problems and speakers could not have been better. Issues such as how to develop a successful grant, how grants are reviewed and funded, explained to us by the very same characters involved in such problems in real life, were extremely instructive and informative. The opportunity of networking with so many relevant individuals in the different divisions and branches of the NCI, the exciting visit to the NIH as well as the mock study section were all excellent and enlightening ideas. Last but not least, the welcoming, friendly and relaxed environment that we enjoyed throughout the five days that we worked together was just what we needed to feel in a big family. Thank you very much for having invited me to participate in this workshop, as well as to talk in the session about Mentor-Mentee relations. I really do not have any suggestions to improve the quality of this workshop for next year, because I think it really more than met our expectations. I look forward to assist next year!!!

Warm regards to you, Bobby, Eric and Dr. Alfred."

We also learn from our participants. **Juan Cordero (Weill Medical College of Cornell University)** deserves a lot of credit for doing his homework and learning about the NIH website and he wanted to share what he found with you.

<http://grants.nih.gov/training/kwizard/index.htm>

"Career Award Wizard" to find out all about Individual NIH Career Awards that might be right for you.

The workshop participants found the review process for supplements of interest. We would like to share that information with all of you.

**REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR SUPPLEMENT APPLICATIONS**

All supplements, RPGs, CURE (R25s, K12s, and P30s), should be mailed to the NCI Referral Officer - not to the Center for Scientific Review (CSR) and not to our office. Supplements going to CSR often wind up lost, or sent to the wrong office. Supplements mailed to our office have to be delivered to the NCI Referral Office by us. The address for the NCI Referral Office is: 6116 Executive Boulevard, Suite 8062, MSC 8329, Bethesda, MD 20892. The Referral Office logs the supplements in and then sends it to our office along with a copy for the Program Director of the parent grant.

Once it is received in our office, it is logged in, checked for eligibility, and a letter either acknowledging receipt or explaining why the application is not acceptable is sent to the applicant (the PI of the parent grant), usually within 48 hours of receipt. We are now sending PERSONAL DATA SHEETS (PDS) with the letters requesting information on the minority investigators in order to include them in our CURE database. So when your mentor (PI of the parent grant) receives this acknowledgement letter, make sure you pass it on to the minority student/investigator (MI). In the future, awards will not be made until the PDS is returned by the MI.

A copy of the eligible supplement application, together with an evaluation form, is then sent to the program director of the parent grant, with the request that they return the completed evaluation within two weeks of receipt. In the case of all supplements except Junior Faculty (MIS) and CURE supplements (P30, R25 and K12), the program director's evaluation together with CMBB staff acceptance is used for making funding recommendations. MIS, P30, R25, and K12 supplements are taken to the Comprehensive Minority Program Advisory Committee (CMPAC) for review. CMPAC meets once a month (or on an as needed basis). A Summary of Review (the equivalent of a Summary Statement) is written for the CURE supplements and sent to the PIs. The supplements that are recommended for award processed for funding. In the case of a supplement not recommended for an award, a letter is written to the PI with the reasons for the rejection.

Exception Forms (funding plan) must be written justifying support for each supplement. These

forms are then sent to: the CMBB Branch Chief, Dr. Sanya Springfield; the Administrative Officer, Mr. Steve Kelly; the Deputy Director for Extramural Science, Dr. Robert Wittes; and the Extramural Financial Data Branch, Ms. Stephanie Carson, for signature. When all the signatures have been collected, a copy of the signed form is sent to our office so that we know the funding plan has been signed by all of those who need to. This office then sends a letter to the PI informing them that their supplement has been scientifically and programmatically approved and recommended for funding by the Grants Administration Branch (GAB). GAB then negotiates the terms and conditions of award dollars, start date, etc. Once the terms of award are addressed, GAB sends a Notice of Grant Award to the PI. Program offices like ours only recommend.

Hopefully this helps explain the steps involved in reviewing and awarding a simple supplement application. But, never hesitate to call and check. We don't mind getting your calls.

However, one other very important step is the Progress Reports; the reporting of progress on an annual basis. Remember, if no progress report is received, or if the minority portion of the progress report is seen to be insufficient, Dr. Springfield will call or send a letter to the PI and request further information. It is preferable to send a separate progress report on the minority supplement.

The format for the PDS and the Progress Report will be available on our web page soon!

We hope you find this information helpful the next time you apply for a supplement and you will also understand why it takes longer than you think to actually get paid..

### **MINORITY INSTITUTION/CANCER CENTER PROGRAM TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORKSHOP**

The MI/CC Program Technical Assistance Workshop was held in New Orleans, LA on May 12-13, 2000. Approximately 130 representatives from Minority Institutions and NCI Cancer Centers were in attendance. **Dr.**

**Larry Alfred**, Program Director, CMBB and **Dr. Brian Kimes**, Director, OCTR, welcomed the participants and described the purpose and objectives of this new initiative and explained the role that NCI would play in the program.

Also on the agenda were **Drs. Norman Maldonado from the University of Puerto Rico and Martin Abeloff from the Johns Hopkins Oncology Center**, who gave the perspectives of the a Minority Serving Institution and a Cancer Center. Reports from pilot experiments with MSI/Cancer Center Partnerships were given by **Drs. Tony Strickland (Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science), Edward Partridge (The University of Alabama, Birmingham), Harry Gibbs (The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center), Lucile Adams-Campbell (Howard University Cancer Center), Harold Moses (Vanderbilt-Ingram Cancer Center), and Ken Harewood (North Carolina Central University)**.

The three RFAs, RFA CA-01-002, **Comprehensive Minority Institution/Cancer Center Partnership**, RFA CA-01-003, **Planning Grant for Minority Institution/Cancer Center Collaborations**, and RFA CA-01-008, **Cooperative Planning Grant for Comprehensive Minority Institution/Cancer Center Partnership** were discussed in great detail; their common features and differences delineated; the application process and review criteria described and many questions were answered. The TAW also included breakout sessions for each mechanism and their was also time provided for networking, collaboration and partnership.

All in all, those that participated in the workshop had a chance to learn all about our new initiatives. The responses from this TAW were extremely positive.

Letters of Intent for all three RFAs are due June 8, 2000. Applications for all three RFAs are due July 26, 2000. Peer Review by a Special Review Committee will be in October/November 2000 with secondary review by the NCAB in February 2001. The earliest anticipated award date is March 1, 2001.

For copies of the RFAs go to the following website:

<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/index.html>.

## CONGRATULATIONS CORNER

In every issue we try to recognize the achievements of our supplement recipients and our career development grantees. This issue we send **congratulations** to:

**Manuel Penichet (UCLA)** was not able to attend the workshop because his wife was expecting a baby at the same time as the workshop. We have since heard that the Penichet's are now the proud parents of a healthy 9 pounds 11 ounces baby. Congratulations and best wishes for a happy future.

**Cornelius A. Watson (Argonne National Laboratory)**, who advises that a recent manuscript of his, Modulation of calmodulin by UV and ionizing radiation (X-rays) in primary endothelial cell cultures, has been conditionally accepted for publication in the *International Journal of Radiation Biology*.

**Kolawole S. Okuyemi and Jasjit S. Ahluwalia (Kansas University Medical Center)** for their article Pharmacotherapy of Smoking Cessation, reprinted from *Archives of Family Medicine*, March 2000, Volume 9.

**J. Abiodun Elegbede (University of Nevada, Las Vegas)**, who made the cover of the *UNLV Magazine*, as one of UNLV's Team of Cancer Fighters. As well as the cover, there is a nice article about his research on page 24.

Below is a list of **Elena Martinez' (Arizona Cancer Center)** activities that we would like to recognize:

1) Colorectal Cancer Progress Review Group member. The group is made up of prominent members of the scientific, medical, and advocacy communities and is charged with outlining and prioritizing a national research agenda for Colorectal cancer. I served as official member and also as chair of the Lifestyle and Environment section. The official document will be available in the next few months.

2) Invited speaker to the "Colorectal Cancer: Unrecognized and Undertreated" conference

organized by the Cancer Research Foundation of America and the American Digestive Health Foundation

3) Invited speaker to the "Nutrition and Cancer Symposium" at the American Association for Cancer Research meeting in San Francisco, April 1-5.

4) Associate Editor to Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention Journal.

And she just heard that their PO1 received a priority score of 136 so there will most definitely be additional news in the very near future.

And our own Program Director, **Eric Bailey**, was a recent speaker at the National Cancer Nursing Research Network's NCI Grant Writing Program. A portion of his talk is quoted in the spring issue of *Minority Nurse*.

**HERE ARE SOME MEMORIES OF OUR YEAR  
2000 MENTORING AND PEER REVIEW  
WORKSHOP**