Policies of HCSRN Multicenter Projects: Affiliated or Ancillary Project Proposals
Existing Policies & Content Comparison

3/14/2012

		BCSC	MHRN	DRN2	CRN
HCSRN project		Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium (BCSC) Funder: NCI PI: Diana Buist Prime Site: Group Health	Mental Health Research Network (MHRN) Funder: NIMH PI: Greg Simon Prime Site: Group Health	DEcIDE Distributed Research Network II Funder: AHRQ PI: Richard Platt Prime Site: Harvard Pilgrim	Cancer Research Network Funder: NCI PI: Ed Wagner Prime Site: Group Health
Policy name		*Steps for Submitting a Proposal & Using BCSC Data*	*MHRN Policy: Proposal and Approval of New MHRN Projects*	*Network Design, Querying Capabilities, Security Features and Governance Policies for the AHRQ DEcIDEnet*	*CRN Collaboration Guidelines, including New Proposals & Inquiries*
Link to affiliated or ancillary project policies		link	link	link	link
Content Area Element	*Version Date*	9/27/2011	5/23/2011	5/11/2011	9/5/2003
Proposal idea submission, review and decision making processes for consortium-funded <u>core projects</u> (e.g., during renewals)	Newly proposed activities that are consortium-funded (e.g., core project proposals for renewals, pilot and feasibility projects funded by core) may be included in a separate section or document, if applicable or desired.		++		
Proposal idea submission, review and decision making processes for consortium-funded <u>pilot projects</u>	(a) Pilot proposals that would be independently funded, yet draw upon the resources of the consortium (e.g., infrastructure, existing data sets, participation across multiple sites, etc.) (b) Newly proposed pilot projects that are consortium-funded (e.g., pilot and feasibility projects funded by the core award). May be included in a separate section or document, if applicable or desired. (c) May encompass training grants, proposals involving consortia and non-consortia sites (HCSRN or external), projects involving new data collection, projects analyzing existing data only, and so on. Policies do not generally apply to single site studies given site autonomy.		++		
Proposal idea submission, review and decision making processes for <u>affiliated or ancillary projects</u> of the consortium (i.e., independently funded, yet drawing on resources of the consortium)	(a) Proposals that would be independently funded, yet draw upon the resources of the consortium (e.g., infrastructure, existing data sets, participation across multiple sites, etc.) (b) May encompass training grants, proposals involving consortia and non-consortia sites (HCSRN or external), projects involving new data collection, projects analyzing existing data only, and so on. Policies do not generally apply to single site studies given site autonomy.	++	++		++
Guidance and considerations relating to site participation	(a) Policies addressed whether or not proposal PIs and sites could be from outside the consortium (or HCSRN). (b) Practical considerations were often included as general guidance (e.g., budget caps, staff availability, etc.) (c) Though final decision making and budgetary authority resides with the ancillary proposal PI, consortium leaders may be available to advise on the most appropriate sites to include on a specific proposal.		++	+	++
Allowability and process for revising and resubmitting a proposal not approved	(a) Most projects allowed for revisions. Decisions often were one of three categories, such as: Support without modification, Suggest modifications and reconsideration, or Decline to support. (b) Some policies explicitly indicated that except in rare cases where major difficulties existed, the goal was to approve or modify/approve all proposed projects. (c) Extant policies did not appear to address potential timeline constraints for re-review, should the PI be pursuing an open FOA. New policy writers may wish to address this proactively, though it may occur infrequently.	+	++		++
Resolution of competing or conflicting proposals, or other dispute resolution	(a) May ask competing or conflicting proposal investigators to resolve independently, bringing in another body (e.g., Executive Committee, Proposal Committee) to assist, if needed. (b) May review competing proposals separately and vote on which will proceed. (c) May also include path for resolving general disputes relating to collaboration (e.g., site selection, review decisions, site performance post-funding, etc.)		++	+	++
Expectations and/or reporting requirements for approved studies	(a) Depending upon the nature of the consortia and its needs, the proposal PI may be required to provide periodic updates to the consortia (e.g., Steering Committee). This may include funding status post-approval, periodic progress updates post-funding. New methods developed by ancillary studies may also require sharing. (b) Acknowledgement of support from the consortia in presentations and publications was often an explicit requirement.	++	+	+	
Circumstances or changes to approved proposals requiring re-review and approval	(a) Significant changes to a project often required resubmission and approval. It was helpful when specific examples of what would and would not be considered "significant" was included. (b) Approved proposals that were not submitted for funding within a pre-determined time period sometimes also required resubmission.	++			++
Process, expectations and conditions for distributed or menu-driven queries and datamarts	Less common. See DRN2 policy document.			+	

Relative indication of extent of content on each topic

-   (no content on this topic)
+   (brief content on this topic)
++ (more developed content on this topic)