An Insider’s View of Study Section—Part 3

When the actual review of each NIH proposal starts, the three assigned reviewers each speak in turn. They’ve had a chance to see each other’s critiques and scores, and so can react to those as well in their comments.

Reviewer 1 has the job of summarizing the proposal briefly and then discussing its merits according to NIH’s criteria of significance, innovativeness, soundness of approach, investigator competence and/or experience, and finally institutional support for research, summarizing these in an “Overall impact” rating which will set the range for the panel’s votes. Reviewers 2 and 3 add to reviewer 1’s comments. Any disagreement among the reviewers is discussed openly. Many times, one reviewer will identify weaknesses that the others missed; sometimes score differences reflect differential weighting of the criteria. For example, one reviewer may feel that the proposal’s innovativeness outweighs minor problems in approach. Often though, especially for new applications, reviewers simply require greater clarification or find details within the proposal unclear, leading to lower scores. After the discussion, a restatement of the range of scores for that proposal, the entire panel votes electronically. The votes will be in the range set by the primary set of 3 reviewers, unless a panel member states publicly that, based on the discussion, they wish to either score the proposal higher or lower. Except in this last instance, the votes are confidential. We never know, leaving the meeting, what the final score of any proposal is, or which might be likely to be funded. Our only clue is if the same proposal comes back for re-review one or two rounds later. Sometimes, the grant will come back to the same reviewer for re-review, but usually there will be at least one new reviewer in the mix. When reviewing resubmissions, reviewers have access to the critiques from the previous review, as well as the new application. So even if a reviewer is seeing it for the first time, they have information on the prior review, as well as the PI’s response to it.

That’s the process at NIH/CSR. Needless to say, it’s a LONG day on Thursday. But, we have time to socialize and get to know each other on breaks and at the panel group dinner on Thursday evening. Our Exec. Sec. always out-does herself in picking a great restaurant for us to unwind in. It’s an early night though because we start early again on Friday! I have greater respect for reviewers and the review process having experienced both sides of the process. I take pride in knowing that some of the proposals that I ranked highly will make that “significant overall impact” on the science of mental and behavioral health and prevention, that we all seek.

Dr. Rubab Qureshi was awarded a grant by the NJ Health Foundation entitled An Assessment of Current and Future Nurses’ Attitudes Towards Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and Transgender People. This project will measure attitudes of nurses and nursing students for the subsequent development of an intervention to change behaviors and attitudes towards homosexuality or the LGBT community.

Dr. Patricia Hindin was awarded a grant by the NJ Health Foundation entitled Intimate Partner Violence and Risk for Cervical Cancer. This project will examine the association between intimate partner violence and abnormal Pap test results among low-income, Black, and Hispanic women.

Dr. Denise Tate submitted a proposal to HRSA/Nursing Work Force Diversity entitled The Nursing as an Additional Language and Culture Program for Academic Success. This project will provide educational, programmatic, and financial assistance to selected nursing students from disadvantaged backgrounds through pre-entry preparation and support activities during the length of the program.

Wolin & Wolin’s Seven Resiliencies

3. RELATIONSHIPS

Making fulfilling connections to other people.

“Relationships are the buffer that cushion you in times of stress and make you well rounded.”
Dr. Yuri Jadotte submitted a proposal to the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute entitled Using Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis as Comparative Effectiveness Research Methodologies to Assess Health Outcomes and Costs in Persons with Multiple Chronic Conditions (MCC) in the United States. The objective of this research project is to synthesize evidence from primary research studies with regards to the clinical effectiveness of treatment and management interventions for patients with MCC.

Dr. Rula Wilson submitted a proposal to the NIH (R15 area) entitled HPV Vaccination Among Ethnically Diverse Black Adolescents in Low-Income Areas. This objective of this project is to explore factors that influence HPV vaccination among low-income, ethnically diverse Black adolescents in New Jersey.

Dr. Kathleen Jackson submitted a proposal to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation entitled Engaging the Community, A Nurse-Led Camden Community Health Center. The project will provide services to Ablett Village, a low-income housing neighborhood in Camden City. An inter-professional health care team will provide comprehensive primary care and patient centered management of acute and chronic illnesses.

KUDOS TO ALL FOR YOUR DILIGENCE IN GETTING THESE GRANTS SUBMITTED (AND AWARDED!) CONGRATULATIONS AND CONTINUED SUPPORT TO OUR NEW INVESTIGATORS!

Journal Article(s) of the Month

Why Wait: The Science Behind Procrastination—Author: Eric Jaffe
Adopted from The Observer
Distributed by The Association for Psychological Science (Vol. 26 #4, April 2013)
Procrastination is complex in its causes and the ways it affects lives. In the past 20 years, the behavior of putting things off has received a burst of interest from scientists working to gather empirical evidence about why we wait. The consequences can be taxing on your well-being.

The Health Services Research (HSR) has issued a special issue entitled:
Simulation Methods in Health Services Research: Applications for Policy, Management, and Practice
(Volume 48 #2, April, 2013, Part II).

Of particular interest in this publication are the following editorials/chapters:
⇒ Using Microsimulation Models to Inform U.S. Health Policy Making
⇒ Practice Variation, Bias, and Experiential Learning in Cesarean Delivery: A Data-Based System Dynamics Approach
⇒ Resource Use Trajectories for Aged Medicare Beneficiaries with Complex Coronary Conditions
⇒ Simulating the Impact of Long-Term Care Policy on Family Eldercare Hours
⇒ The Impact of Profitability of Hospital Admissions on Mortality
⇒ Income Eligibility Thresholds, Premium Contributions, and Children’s Coverage Outcomes: A Study of CHIP Expansions
Congratulations to the following who were in press/published and presented:

- Dr. Patricia Hindin presented at the 3rd Annual Women's Health Symposium at UMD NJ on 3/21/13. Her presentation was entitled Condoms, Coercion, and Intimate Partner Violence.
- Dr. Mercedes Echevarria & Dr. Patricia Hindin will be presenting at the NONPF 39th Annual Meeting in Pittsburgh, PA on 4/14/13. Their presentation is entitled Maintaining Rigor in DNP Capstone Projects: A Look Within.
- Dr. Gina Marie Miranda-Diaz presented a podium presentation and poster entitled Influencing Breast Cancer Screening in Hispanic Latina Women: A Pilot Train-the-Trainer Program at the Delta Zeta Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau in Union City, NJ in early April. She will also present a poster of these data findings at the Annual Doctoral Research Day at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York on 4/23/13.
- Ms. Juanita Ormilon, BSN, RNC-NIC, MSN will be presenting at the 24th Research Congress STTI in Prague, Czech Republic in July, 2013. Ms. Ormilon will be doing a podium presentation entitled Noise Pollution in with Workplace.

PUBLICATIONS

As part of SN’s 20th Anniversary Celebration, the Research Committee held a FACULTY RESEARCH POSTER DAY on 4/8/13 in Newark. It was designed so that faculty would have the opportunity to showcase the diverse research and evidence-based projects with which they have been involved and are currently pursuing. Approximately 60 participants were on hand to hear a welcome by Dr. Susan Salmond, SN Dean. Dr. Rula Wilson, Associate Professor continued the program with a presentation entitled “Challenges and Rewards of Research.” Dr. Margaret Sullivan, Associate Dean for Research, concluded the presentations with her remarks noting the trends in funding interdisciplinary and translational (bench to practice) research. She also expressed that if funding was not received, try, try again.

Thirty one posters were showcased. Topics included technology, childhood, health disparities, HIV/AIDS, nursing education, and combat veterans just to name a few. Faculty were able to share their experiences and research knowledge with one another as they networked and discussed the many posters.

A special heartfelt congratulations goes out to Dr. Mary Jo Bugel, LaTasha Pugh, and Thomas DiStefano for your successful organization of the event!

If you were not able to attend and are interested in getting a complete list of the posters that were presented, please call Cheryl Thiemann at 973-972-9588 or e-mail THIEMACL@UMDNJ.EDU.

UPCOMING RESEARCH EVENTS

♦ The Association for Psychological Science will be sponsoring its 25th Annual Convention on May 23-26, 2013 in Washington, D.C. The theme this year is Building a Better Psychological Science: Good Data Practices and Replicability. If you require further information, the website address is www.psychologicalscience.org/convention.

♦ The Brown Bag Lunch is a bi-monthly informal series sponsored by the Research Committee designed to address the needs of all faculty and to develop their research skills and activities.

Watch for the next session in May, 2013.
GENERAL NEWS

RESEARCH GRANTS AND CONTRACTS REFERENCE GUIDE NOW AVAILABLE!

In response to questions received about the integration’s impact on grant applications and management, a guide for Rutgers and UMDNJ faculty and staff has been developed and posted at orsp.rutgers.edu and at www.umdnj.edu/research/. The guide, which will be updated regularly, offers information about proposal development, existing grants and contracts, regulatory compliance, and pending awards. Questions can be directed to integration-grants@rutgers.edu

EXCERPT FROM THE RUTGERS MAGAZINE

Rutger’s University is a newly accepted member of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), the nation’s premiere consortium of top-notch research universities. Think of it as the “BIG 15” of academic research. The addition of Rutgers, along with the University of Maryland-College Park will increase CIC membership to 15 institutions, which will collectively engage in $9.3 billion in funded research each year and will add another eight million library volumes and more than 5,600 full-time faculty to the consortium. The universities are leaders in cutting edge, collaborative research projects in areas as diverse as biotechnology, transportation, cybersecurity, and food safety. Rutgers will become a member of the consortium on July 1, 2013.