

**DORIS DUKE CHARITABLE FOUNDATION
CLINICAL SCIENTIST DEVELOPMENT AWARD 2012
REQUEST FOR NOMINATIONS**

KEY DATES

Online Nominations due:	November 16, 2011
Proposals due:	December 21, 2011
Notice of Award:	June 1, 2012
Award Start Date:	July 1, 2012

ABOUT THE DORIS DUKE CHARITABLE FOUNDATION

The Doris Duke Charitable Foundation (DDCF) is a philanthropic organization with the mission to improve the quality of people's lives through grants supporting the performing arts, environmental conservation, medical research and the prevention of child abuse, according to the wishes of Doris Duke, as established in her will. DDCF also preserves the cultural and environmental legacy of Doris Duke's properties. The Clinical Scientist Development Award (CSDA) Program described in this Request for Nominations is part of the Foundation's Medical Research Program.

PURPOSE OF THE DORIS DUKE CLINICAL SCIENTIST DEVELOPMENT AWARD PROGRAM

The purpose of the Doris Duke CSDA Program is to provide support for mentored research to junior faculty members with an M.D., M.D.-Ph.D. or equivalent medical degree (physician-scientists) working in any disease area as they begin their careers as independent clinical researchers. The early stage of career development, when a researcher is building a research program to seek funding as an independent principal investigator, is a critical period. The demands to balance patient care with research, together with the complexity of today's research environment, make it harder for physician-scientists to become independent investigators. With only 2%¹ of US physicians identifying research as their main professional activity and an estimated 10 year attrition rate of 39% for assistant professors with an M.D. degree², the Clinical Scientist Development Award program aims to enable promising early career physician-scientists to attain independent research program grant funding and to build successful careers in clinical research.

The 2012 Clinical Scientist Development Awards consist of \$150,000 direct costs plus \$12,000 (8%) indirect costs per year for 3 years.

¹ Smart. *Physician Characteristics and Distribution in the US*. in (Ed). 2011 edn, American Medical Association, 2011.

² Alexander and Lang. The Long-term Retention and Attrition of U.S. Medical School Faculty. *Analysis in Brief, Association of American Medical Colleges* 8 (2008).

APPLICATION PROCESS

Participants in the Clinical Scientist Development Award competition must be nominated by their institutions. All accredited academic U.S. degree granting institutions are invited to submit nominations for up to **two** candidates. The definition of a “nominating institution” is given below. Nominations must be made through the office of the Dean of the degree-granting institution. It is the responsibility of the nominating institution to verify that the nominees meet all eligibility criteria for the competition.

Nominations must be submitted online on or before 5 p.m. EST November 16, 2011.

Instructions on how to submit nominations and the required information are posted on the main [Clinical Scientist Development Award web page](#). All nominations from an institution must be entered at the same time. Replacement of nominees will not be permitted. We strongly encourage institutions to nominate women and underrepresented minorities in medicine, including Blacks or African Americans, Hispanics or Latinos, American Indians, Alaskan Natives, and Native Hawaiians.

Nominees will be emailed instructions on how to submit their application no later than November 21, 2011. Nominees may contact us if instructions have not been received by that date. We recommend that nominees add ddcf@aibs.org to their email safe senders list.

Full applications must be submitted by nominees on or before 5 p.m. EST on December 21, 2011.

Applications will be peer-reviewed in a two stage process. In the first stage, a panel of advisors will review applications and recommend finalists for the next stage. The strongest applications will then move onto the second stage, where the proposal will be critiqued and discussed for funding priority by a second review panel. Up to 12 awards will be recommended for funding in 2012. Please note: Written reviewers’ comments will not be provided to candidates who do not proceed to the second stage. Brief comments will be provided to candidates whose proposals are reviewed in the second stage.

NOMINEE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

To be competitive, it is recommended that nominees have significant research experience and strong publication records. Applicants must:

- Have received an M.D. or a foreign equivalent from an accredited institution
- Be working in a U.S. degree-granting institution, but *do not* have to be U.S. citizens
- Have a full-time faculty position not higher than the Assistant Professor level. Full-time post-fellowship Instructor positions will be considered full-time faculty level appointments **ONLY** when these positions are recognized as full-time faculty appointments by the nominating institution. Adjunct or acting faculty positions are not eligible for this competition.
- Propose a clinical research project, as defined by the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, in any disease area. A definition of clinical research can be found below.
- Have been appointed to their first full-time faculty position between January 1, 2007 and January 1, 2012.

- Be guaranteed a minimum overall research time protection of 75% of full-time professional effort by the nominating institution, in the event an award is made. There is no explicit minimum percent effort that must be dedicated to the CSDA project.
- *Not* be the principal investigators or co-principal investigators on a National Institutes of Health R01 research grant, a research project that is part of a P01 program project or a P50 center grant, or a U01 cooperative agreement. An award will not be made if the applicant becomes the principal investigator or co-principal investigator on NIH grants, as mentioned above, prior to or on the date of the Clinical Scientist Development Award start date.

Note: Applicants are allowed to hold a National Institutes of Health K series award or other career development award at the same time as the CSDA grant. However, the applicant must propose distinct and different research aims in their CSDA application and there should be no scientific overlap.

REVIEW AND SELECTION CRITERIA

- Suitability of the proposed research to the Foundation’s mission and definition of clinical research.
- Evidence of the applicant’s commitment to a clinical research career.
- Applicant’s formal research training, laboratory experience, and productivity.
- Evidence of the applicant’s original research in the relevant area.
- Importance of the research to the field.
- Originality of the research proposal.
- Appropriateness of the methodology and scope of the project.
- Commitment of the applicant’s department and institution to the area of research and to the applicant.
- Resources available to the applicant. (Candidates will not be penalized for having other sources of funding; however there should be no scientific overlap between the proposed aims of the CSDA research and the aims of research supported by other awards.)

Applicants are encouraged to propose research that is innovative, interfaces with different scientific disciplines, and has the potential of pushing the frontiers of clinical research.

DEFINITIONS

Clinical research

Clinical research involves the scientific investigation of the etiology, prevention, diagnosis, or treatment of human disease using human subjects, human populations or materials of human origin. Included in the definition are studies that utilize tissues or pathogens only if they can be linked to a patient.

It is expected that the research protocols of grant applicants will require Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. Occasionally, the Foundation has funded research that does not require IRB approval, such as research using de-identified patient populations. If a research project is being proposed that does not require IRB approval, applicants or their nominating institutions are strongly encouraged to

contact program staff to discuss whether the proposed research falls within the Foundation's definition of clinical research.

In keeping with the wishes expressed in Doris Duke's will, experiments that utilize animals or primary tissues derived from animals will not be supported by this program.

Nominating institution

For this purpose, a "nominating institution" is defined as all affiliated graduate schools, related hospitals and research institutes. Different divisions, departments, hospitals, centers, or schools of the same degree-granting institution should confer to submit one slate of nominees. Deans of medical schools are encouraged to confer with schools of public health or other appropriate graduate schools within their institution.

DDCF can award grants only to institutions that have letters from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service documenting that they have been determined to be exempt from federal income taxation as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code"), and that they are not a private foundation or a Type III supporting organization as defined in Section 509(a) of the Code. Please note that the online nomination and the proposal must list the name of the nominating institution and also the name of the specific branch of the institution (related hospital, research institute, foundation affiliated with a state university, etc.) that will accept and administer any award if different from the main institution. The institution accepting and administering any DDCF award must have the IRS tax-status determination letter(s) described above.

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD AND INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUG APPROVAL

Institutional Review Board and Investigational New Drug Approvals, if necessary, are not required at the time of nomination or proposal submission. However, if necessary, evidence of Investigational New Drug approval must be provided to the Foundation before an award can be made. If a grant is awarded, DDCF strongly prefers Institutional Review Board approval to be in place by the grant start date, July 1, 2012. Institutional Review Board approval **must** be in place by October 1, 2012. The grantee may not conduct activities supported by the CSDA that involve human subjects until a copy of the Institutional Review Board approval is received at the foundation. We recommend that you coordinate with your Institutional Review Board to ensure timely approval.

QUESTIONS

If you have any questions concerning this Request for Nominations or submitting a nomination or proposal, please read the [Frequently Asked Questions](#). If your question is not answered there, email Jennifer Petitt at ddcf@aibs.org with "2012 CSDA" as the subject line.