



2024 Community-Partnered Participatory Research Awards (CPPRA)

CPPRA Key Dates

A letter of intent is required for the CPPRA grant type. You are encouraged to contact Tobacco-Related Disease Research Program with questions about applying for the CPPRA.

Call open	Friday, June 30, 2023
Applicant Webinar for CPPRA applicants	Tuesday, July 18, 2023 10:00-11:00 a.m. PT
LOI submission deadline	Thursday, August 24, 2023 12 p.m. (noon) PT
Invitation to Full Application Announced	Thursday, August 31, 2023
Due date for new applications and resubmissions	Thursday, October 26, 2023 12 p.m. (noon) PT
Applicants notified	April 2024
Awards start	July 1, 2024

Use the following link to register and join the applicant webinar or find the recording on our website: Community-Partnered Participatory Research Award (CPPRA) Applicant Webinar, Tuesday, July 18, 2023, 10:00 a.m.- 11:00 a.m. PT (<https://UCOP.zoom.us/meeting/register/tJcpcO6gpzsjHtSgL0pJ2OqsYPGV7OsyA7cd>)

Contact Information for Inquiries

Tobacco-Related Disease Research Program (<https://trdrp.org/>)

Research Grants Program Office (<https://www.ucop.edu/research-grants-program/>)

Research & Innovation (<https://www.ucop.edu/research-innovation/about-ri.html>)

University of California Office of the President (<https://www.ucop.edu/>)

Email: trdrp@ucop.edu

Introduction to Community-Partnered Participatory Research Awards

The Tobacco-Related Disease Research Program (TRDRP) has funded community and academic research partnerships for over 20 years. Our firm commitment to funding research that fosters equitable collaborations between community members and experienced research scientists stems from a belief that integrating rigorous scientific methodology with community involvement at each phase of the process leads to more sustainable and effective tobacco prevention and cessation interventions that can improve the health of Californians. Building capacity for California communities to tackle complex tobacco control issues through scientific methods is a value-added contribution from the research enterprise to California's successful comprehensive tobacco prevention and control effort. Community-partnered participatory research has the potential to directly redress tobacco-related health disparities impacting priority populations, which makes this grant type essential in this new era of social justice and health equity for marginalized populations.

Community-academic research partnerships can substantially enhance the quality, reach, and impact of tobacco-related prevention and treatment interventions and regional policy efforts. Collaborative research teams that include perspectives and contributions from the community of interest have the potential to produce meaningful findings, buy-in among community members, adoption of evidence-informed practice and policy change by organizations serving the community, and ultimately reduce or eliminate tobacco-related health disparities.

In this request for applications (RFA), TRDRP solicits community research applications that are built from empirical questions that grow out of community concerns and interests, contribute to community science frameworks, and are grounded in equitable partnership and leadership models. Research projects with this focus are called by various names such as action research, community-based participatory research (CBPR), participatory action research (PAR), and community-partnered participatory research (CPPR). This RFA calls for Community-Partnered Participatory Research Award (CPPRA) applications. The term CPPR is used to highlight the importance of authentic and equitable community-academic partnership in the intent of this award type.

Community is a multifactorial social construct and is defined here as a group of people who share a common characteristic: race or ethnicity, age, sex, gender identity, sexual identity, cultural identity, school system, health system, outpatient clinic, residential program, mental health status, disease status or risk level, disability, socioeconomic status, geographical region, or organizational affiliation.

About TRDRP

The Tobacco-Related Disease Research Program ([TRDRP](#)) transforms tobacco taxes into cutting edge research to reduce commercial tobacco use and tobacco-related diseases and to inform public policy that benefits California's diverse populations. The TRDRP funds tobacco-related disease research through two voter-approved Propositions: [Proposition 99](https://ballotpedia.org/California Proposition 99, Tobacco Tax Increase (1988);) ([https://ballotpedia.org/California Proposition 99, Tobacco Tax Increase \(1988\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California Proposition 99, Tobacco Tax Increase (1988);)); approved in 1988) and [Proposition 56](https://ballotpedia.org/California Proposition 56, Tobacco Tax Increase (2016);) ([https://ballotpedia.org/California Proposition 56, Tobacco Tax Increase \(2016\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California Proposition 56, Tobacco Tax Increase (2016);)); approved in 2016) which instituted state excise taxes on multiple tobacco products and mandates allocations to the University of California to administer funds for tobacco-related disease research that contributes to health promotion in California.

TRDRP follows a grant review and administration process that is similar to the National Institutes of Health (NIH). More details about grant processes and eligibility criteria that apply to all TRDRP grant types are explained in the 2024 TRDRP Core Call for Applications, which also applies to the Pilot and Full CPPRA grant types (See <https://trdrp.org/> for the 2024 Call information).

TRDRP Strategic Plan

CPPRA grant applications must broadly address at least one of TRDRP strategic objectives, which is located at <https://trdrp.org/about/strategic-plan/>. The CPPRA grant type closely aligns with TRDRP’s strategic objectives to:

- Utilize collaborative and interdisciplinary approaches to address key programmatic and research needs for effective and innovative tobacco control policymaking.
- Support communities most vulnerable to tobacco-related health disparities by providing them and our partner organizations with real time, relevant, and actionable research findings to promote health equity and reduce negative impacts of tobacco in all California communities.

Additional information about TRDRP’s Strategic Plan is located here: <https://trdrp.org/about/strategic-plan/>

TRDRP Research Priority Areas

All CPPRA applications must closely address a TRDRP research priority area in their specific aims. See Appendix A in the TRDRP 2024 Call for Applications for details. Broadly, TRDRP’s research priorities cover the following important areas in tobacco control:

- Research Questions in Support of the End Commercial Tobacco Campaign
- Social and Behavioral Prevention and Treatment
- State and Local Tobacco Control Policy Research
- Tobacco-Related Diseases
- Environmental Exposure and Toxicology
- Neuroscience of Nicotine Addiction and Treatment

Award Purpose

Supports both **Pilot** and **Full** Community-Partnered Participatory Research Award (CPPRA) applications that are collaboratively developed and led by one Community Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI) and one Academic Co-PI. Both Co-PIs participate in an equitable process in writing and discussing application materials, from idea inception until application submission and, if funded, equitable collaboration with authentic community involvement at each phase of the research process, from grant initiation/pre-award processes until study findings are ready for dissemination activities to amplify community impact.

This grant type has multiple requirements, including a collaborative, equitable research partnership comprised of a Community Co-PI and Academic Co-PI with guidance from a Community Advisory Board (CAB).

CPPRA Award Mechanism

Pilot CPPRA Applications

Purpose: The **Pilot CPPRA** provides up to **2-years** of support for the initial phase of a project, including testing the acceptability and feasibility of methods, strengthening collaborative relationships, developing tools and methods for a later intervention, collecting preliminary data, rigorously evaluating existing tobacco prevention or treatment programs or services, and demonstrating proof-of-principle to support the feasibility of a new paradigm or research hypothesis or to rigorously evaluate the utility of existing tobacco prevention or treatment programs. The ultimate goal of the Pilot CPPRA is to provide initial support for partnered research with a strong rationale and potential to inform a prevention or cessation intervention in the future. Results from Pilot CPPRAs should enhance the team's ability to leverage future funding from TRDRP or other funders. A Pilot CPPRA can have a specific aim focused on developing the community-academic research partnership, and collaborative teams can be newly developed or new to tobacco prevention and treatment community science. Budgets will be carefully scrutinized for appropriateness to the work proposed.

- **Maximum award amount per year:** \$500,000 per year (Direct Costs).
 - **Community Co-PI budget max:** \$250,000 per year.
 - **Academic Co-PI budget max:** \$250,000 per year.
- **Maximum duration:** 2 years.
- **Allowable direct costs:** Salaries, trainee/internship costs, fringe benefits, supplies, participant incentives, costs to develop print and digital intervention materials, sub-contracts, equipment (costing more than \$5,000), travel, publishing costs and other dissemination activities.
- **Travel:**
 - **Project-related travel:** As needed in each Co-PI budget (must be fully justified).
 - **Travel to TRDRP conference (Mandatory):** \$750 for the Community Co-PI; \$750 for the Academic Co-PI.
 - **Scientific conference travel:** maximum of \$2,000 per year for the Community Co-PI; maximum of \$2,000 per year for the Academic Co-PI.
- **Indirect costs:** Full indirect costs are allowed to non-UC institutions. Indirect costs to UC campuses are capped at 40 percent, or 25 percent for projects conducted off-campus.

Full CPPRA Applications

Purpose: The **Full CPPRA** provides up to **3-years** of support to develop, evaluate, test, or examine a community tobacco prevention intervention or treatment intervention focused on tobacco-related research issues of importance to the community that is the focus of the project. Full CPPRA grant application research plans can describe the need to collect a small amount of feasibility data; however, specific aims must mainly focus on the development and testing of a community prevention or treatment intervention. The Full CPPRA grant type calls for demonstration, measurement, efficacy, and effectiveness studies as well as, implementation science, randomized controlled trials, or health services research studies focused on a critical tobacco-related disease problem affecting priority groups in California. A competitive CPPRA application will include preliminary data and have a strong theoretical rationale supporting the research questions and methods. The Full CPPRA is intended for well-integrated teams of scientific and community members with a previous work relationship. In most cases, a community-academic team will use the Full CPPRA to complete a research plan developed and initiated during the Pilot CPPRA phase or a pilot grant type from another funder (e.g., NIH R25/R34 grant types). Although a previous Pilot award is not a requirement for the Full CPPRA application, based on past experiences, a pilot project (can be supported by a different funding agency) is strongly recommended as preparation for a future Full award. Budgets will be carefully scrutinized for appropriateness to the work proposed.

- **Maximum award amount per year:** \$600,000 per year (Direct Costs).

- **Community Co-PI budget max:** \$300,000 per year.
- **Academic Co-PI budget max:** \$300,000 per year.
- **Maximum duration:** 3 years.
- **Allowable direct costs:** Salaries, trainee/internship costs, fringe benefits, supplies, participant incentives, sub-contracts, equipment (costing more than \$5,000), travel, publishing costs and other dissemination activities.
- **Travel:**
 - **Project-related travel:** As needed in each Co-PI budget (must be fully justified).
 - **Travel to TRDRP conference (Mandatory):** \$750 for the Community Co-PI; \$750 for the Academic Co-PI.
 - **Scientific conference travel:** maximum of \$2,000 per year for the Community Co-PI; maximum of \$2,000 per year for the Academic Co-PI.
- **Indirect costs:** Full indirect costs are allowed to non-UC institutions. Indirect costs to UC campuses are capped at 40 percent, or 25 percent for projects conducted off-campus.

Additional Budget Considerations for Pilot and Full CPPRAs

- Subcontracts are allowed for each Co-PI organization; must be fully justified. All out-of-state subcontracts and collaborations must be well-justified; *please note that funding for out-of-state expenses are extremely limited and TRDRP does not encourage such expenses.*
- [SmartSimple](#), TRDRP's grant management system, **treats funded Pilot and Full CPPRA grants as one project with two budgets. TRDRP will issue a split-budget award, if funded.** One budget will be prepared by and awarded to the community Co-PI's organization or institution and a second budget will be prepared by and awarded to the academic Co-PI's organization or institution.
- **One organization will be responsible for officially submitting grant materials.** It is up to the applicant research team to decide if the Community Co-PI's or Academic Co-PI's institution will officially submit the grant application.

Eligibility for Pilot and Full CPPRAs

The submitted Pilot or Full CPPRA application must include leadership from a team that includes one Community Co-PI and one Academic Co-PI. Each CPPRA application can have only one Co-PI representing the community side and one Co-PI representing the academic side. If there is a need for other close collaborators, they can be designated in Key Personnel as a Co-Investigator, consultant, or collaborator.

The qualifications of a **Community Co-PI:**

- Based in California.
- Affiliated with an organization, nonprofit community-based group, or institution (i.e., they cannot be a lone person who is not connected to relevant community-based groups) that primarily provides services or resources to people in a community in California.
- Committed to representing the views of the community of interest.
- Have the support of their organization, nonprofit, or institution in order to serve as a Co-PI for the project.
- There is not a requirement for a degree.
- U.S. citizenship is not a requirement.

A community partnership can also involve entities such as school districts, school educators and administrators, educational support service agencies, school-based health centers, county health departments, health care providers, hospitals, outpatient clinics, managed care plans, faith-based organizations, and other nonprofit community-based organizations. Partnerships that involve county health departments, state agencies, and schools or school districts should consider practical issues related to the bureaucracy and inherent structure of these entities, which can hinder a true, equitable partnership. Strategies to promote partnership within busy, under-resourced and hierarchical organizations should be discussed in your grant application. A community partner must be named and their California-based community-serving organization or institution must be named in the submitted application.

Community Co-PI and Partnering Community-Based Organization (CBO)

The **Community Co-PI** represents the community organization and acts as the lead community researcher. **The Community Co-PI must have a managerial or executive-level decision-making role within their respective CBO.** For the CPPRA award type, the Community Co-PI will be responsible for managing their budgeted expenses while their CBO will be responsible for the fiscal administration of the community research budget as a whole. A California-based CBO must be named in the application submission. Even if an organization is identified as closely engaged in the community partnership, a lead person working at the organization must be named. The CBO must name and formerly approve an individual within their organization to serve as the Community Co-PI for this award type. A letter of collaboration is required from either the Community Advisory Board chair, Executive Director of the CBO, or Board of Directors of the CBO indicating support for Co-PI participation and confirming their review and agreement with the details described in the Collaborative Agreements application form.

Academic Co-PI and Partnering Academic Institution

The Academic Co-PI should have research expertise and publications related to the research questions in the proposal and a commitment to developing or enhancing an existing program of research focused on community-partnered participatory research or theoretical frameworks for community science. For the CPPRA award type, the Academic Co-PI will be responsible for managing their budgeted expenses while their university or research institution will be responsible for the fiscal administration of the academic research budget as a whole. An academic partner must be named and their California-based university or research institution must be named in the submitted application.

The qualifications of an **Academic Co-PI**:

- Based at a California academic or nonprofit research institution.
- Has a university faculty appointment or a community research scientist designation with an appointment at a community-based research organization or private research institution.
- Research scientists and community-oriented academics working at a non-university research organization that is a nonprofit can serve in this role.
- Must have PI status. PI status permits the academic applicant access to their institution's infrastructure support for managing research grants.
- Committed to conducting long-term community-partnered participatory research.
- Committed to accurately depicting the state-of-the-science for the community's benefit.
- U.S. citizenship is not a requirement.

Pilot and Full CPPRA Review Criteria

Criteria Set-1 (40 percent scoring weight) “RESEARCH”

- **Statement of Goals, Research Questions, and Specific Aims:** Are the goals clearly stated, achievable, and considered within the context of the partnership’s longer-term research goals? For **Pilot CPPRAs**, will the pilot research activity prepare the collaborative team to pursue further research and to apply for a TRDRP Full CPPRA in the future or funding from another agency? Are the research questions clear and appropriate for a community-partnered participatory award? Are the Specific Aims clear and encompass a reasonable amount of research activity for a Pilot or Full award? Is there a logical connection between Aims and a relationship to the team’s long-term research goals? For **Full CPPRAs**, to what extent do the goals, research questions, and specific aims build on lessons learned from a pilot community-partnered research project?
- **Background, Significance, and Relevance to a Tobacco-Related Area:** Is the community of interest clearly described? Does this study address an important tobacco-related problem? What is the evidence that the stated problem is of concern in the community of interest? Is relevant literature summarized, synthesized appropriately, and does it support the proposed research activity? Is the rationale underlying the proposed research question(s) well-supported and appropriately contextualized with consideration of social and structural determinants of health? Are research activities appropriate to begin addressing the stated tobacco-related research question(s) (particularly for **Pilot CPPRAs**)? To what extent is there evidence that the community-based organization or community members were involved in identifying and conceptualizing the research problem and research project?

Research Plan: Research Design, Conceptual Framework, and Data Analysis Plan: Are the conceptual or theoretical framework, design (including composition of study population and strength of recruitment plan), methods, and analyses adequately developed, well-integrated, well-reasoned, and appropriate to the aims of the project and the nature of the Pilot CPPRA or Full CPPRA grant type? Does the applicant clearly describe relationships to be examined? Does the applicant team acknowledge potential barriers that might hinder study activities and consider alternative strategies? Are the proposed sample sizes adequate to answer the proposed research question(s)? If an intervention is proposed, are the variables and relationships to be examined clearly identified and testable? Is a data analysis plan clearly described? Are project milestones well-defined with quantifiable measures that are appropriate for assessing the success of the Pilot or Full phase award? Is the proposed work feasible? Is the research design aligned with the capacity and expectations of the community and community-based organization (e.g., whether a randomized controlled trial (RCT) design violates community or community organization norms or is a RCT identified by the community as an acceptable design)? To what extent does the team consider relevant social and structural determinants of health factors that might reasonably be expected to impact the project from a health equity perspective? For **Full CPPRAs**, does the research plan build on preliminary findings or pilot work? Does pilot data from previous research enhance the potential of the **Full CPPRA** research plan to lead to useful, reliable or valid outcomes? To what extent will results of the Full CPPRA research activity lead to a tobacco prevention or treatment intervention of potential benefit to the community or priority groups named in the research plan?

Criteria Set-2 (40% scoring weight) “PARTNERSHIP”

- **Partnership Collaboration Plan and Team Communication Process:** Are the collaborative agreements described in the Collaborative Agreement plan clear and likely to lead to project success? Is the communication plan adequate to keep the community-based organization and, Community Advisory Board (CAB) updated on the research? Are there plans to seek input and guidance from the CAB? Is there a clear decision-making process for important project activities? Will the team monitor or evaluate the health of the community-academic partnership over time? Are plans to evaluate the strengths and growth

areas of the community-academic partnership over time meaningful and likely to be useful? For **Full CPPRAs**, has the applicant team demonstrated a successful collaboration in prior research projects?

- **Potential for the Proposed Work to Benefit the Community and Lead to an Intervention:** To what extent is there potential for the proposed research activity, if successful, to redress tobacco-related health disparities or promote a health equity issue among a priority group in California? To what extent are community residents, community-based organizations, and academic institutions likely to benefit from the expected results from the proposed research? Does the pilot research activity have potential to lead to the development of a prevention or treatment intervention (e.g., school-based youth tobacco prevention curriculum, improvement in the delivery of tobacco cessation clinical services, or policy change in a critical area of tobacco control)? For **Full CPPRAs**, is there a plan for translating results into tangible benefits for the community and for informing community members of the results of the research?
- **Community Engagement and Capacity Building:** Does the applicant team propose a sound approach to engaging communities affected by tobacco use in either their collaborative partnership or by proactively informing a community group about the nature and significance of the research question and research outcomes? Will the team obtain feedback from the community or community scientists about the project and its findings? Will the project build capacity in the community, school, health clinic, or community organization for future research; improve tobacco-related service delivery or clinical practice change; or enhance tobacco control programming? To what extent are there opportunities for students at all levels of training and community residents at all educational levels to learn research skills that might expand the pipeline of community-based scientists engaged in tobacco control? Does the dissemination of findings include channels and tools targeting clinicians, other researchers, public health practitioners, educators, advocates, policymakers, funders, or the general public?
- **Dissemination Approaches and Sustainability Plan:** Are there plans to disseminate findings from the project to the community of interest? Will the Community Co-PI or the CAB be involved in interpreting research findings or comprehending what findings mean for the community? Are there plans to disseminate findings using channels and tools readily accessible and known by the community? Are there plans to inform the community of resources made available or improved by the findings from the proposed research? Are there plans to sustain the community-academic research partnership after the pilot or full phase of funding? For **Full CPPRAs**, is there a history of the applicant team successfully disseminating information to a community group? Is appropriate attention placed on sustainability of promising practices derived from the research activity?
- **Statement of Future Goals:** Are future research goals clear and reasonable, and do they consider perspectives from the community of interest? For **Pilot CPPRAs**, are the plans to apply for follow-on grant funding convincing? Could the research activity in the pilot award contribute to a future intervention focused on tobacco prevention or cessation or policy change? For **Full CPPRAs**, are there plans to continually update and improve the efficacy or effectiveness of tobacco prevention or treatment intervention after development?

Criteria Set-3 (20% scoring weight) “RESOURCES”

- **Investigative Team:** Are the co-principal investigators and other key personnel listed in the grant proposal appropriately trained and well-suited to conduct community-partnered participatory research? Are the roles and responsibilities of the partners clearly described? Will the research process allow academic researchers to learn more about the community *and* will community members learn about the scientific research process? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the co-principal investigators and other co-investigators (if any)? Do the investigators demonstrate access to the research

population and community of interest?

- **Environment, Facilities, and Resource Availability:** Will the community locations in which the research will occur contribute to the probability of success? Does the proposed project utilize unique features of the community, institutions, or organizations involved in the research and/or utilize useful collaborative arrangements and assets to sufficiently resource the project? To what extent is the applicant team prepared to manage relevant social and structural determinants of health factors that might impact the environment in which the project is conducted? How prepared is the research team for a situation where community facilities and resources are not fully available to the team for the duration of the project? Is there evidence of academic institutional support and support from the community-based organization(s) involved in the project?
- **Community Assets:** Are community-level assets, strengths, and access channels well-described, appropriate for the study design and research question(s), and likely to contribute to the success of the project? Is the project likely to contribute to strengthening existing community assets for tobacco control? Is there evidence of credibility of the partnering community-based organization within the community of interest, a track record of success in delivering services or programs in the community, and representation by a specific priority population within the organization?

Additional Review Criteria

Reviewers will evaluate the following additional items while determining scientific and technical merit, but will not give separate scores for these items.

- **Budget:** Appropriateness of the budget request for the project, scientific, or budgetary overlap concerns and degree to which out-of-state contracts or collaborations are essential for the project.
- **Protection of Human Subjects from Research Risk:** If human subjects/participants are involved in the research, protections from research risk relating to their participation in the proposed research will be assessed. Applicants must describe efforts to protect people from potential risks/ side effects of study participation and processes to ensure ethical treatment of all human subjects involved in the study. Please complete all sections of the human subjects form to describe the ethical treatment of participants and their data at all stages of the project.
- **Appropriate Inclusion of Women, Minorities, and Children in Research:** If human participants are involved in the research, the adequacy of plans to include participants of all genders, all racial and ethnic groups (and priority groups), and children as appropriate for the scientific goals of the research will be assessed. Plans for the recruitment and retention of participants will also be evaluated.
- **Care and Use of Vertebrate Animals in Research:** If vertebrate animals are involved in the project, plans for their care and use will be assessed.

Application Procedures

Considerations for CPPRA Applications

Programmatic Expectations of Academic & Community Co-PIs

Conducting CPPR requires a continual **commitment to eliminating power differences between Co-PIs so that they are equal partners**. Strong **CPPR teams commit to engaging in bi-directional learning among the community and academic members** involved in the project. This builds capacity for future engagement in CPPR for community and academic organizations involved in the project.

The **spirit of the CPPR model** means that the Community Co-PI and Academic Co-PI closely collaborate on all aspects of the research process including:

- Identifying and developing the research question(s)
- Transforming community concerns into research questions
- Active, transparent, and frequent communication
- Working closely with CAB members
- Writing and submitting the research proposal
- Developing a plan for sustainability beyond the proposed project
- Designing and implementing the research project
- Analyzing and interpreting findings
- Preparing and submitting progress reports to the funder
- Co-authoring summaries for communities, scientific papers, policy briefs, and presentations
- Disseminating results to community and scientific audiences to foster collective impact in the community.

To reach the level of collaboration described above, a community-academic research team must:

- Pay attention to the development and health of the collaborative relationship.
- Have a flexible, open communication style and plan that can accommodate differences in how community members and academic faculty work independently and collaboratively.
- Develop and engage in an equitable shared decision-making process and collaborative plan.
- Engage with a CAB that includes representation from the community of interest.
- Develop a mutually agreeable plan for sharing power, decision-making authority, daily work on the project budget, and resources including study data.
- Ensure that the budgets for community and academic partners are equitable and adequate for the activities assigned to each partner.
- Promote opportunities for the community and academic members of the team to contribute to manuscripts prepared for publication and reports for community and policy change makers.
- Develop and implement dissemination/communication strategies that are sensitive to the culture, experiences, structural social determinants of health, and needs of the community.

School-Based Research Partnerships

Given the varied, but still concerning, use patterns for electronic nicotine devices, flavored tobacco, cannabis-tobacco co-use among adolescents along with new threats from flavored nicotine pouches, community research scientists and faculty are encouraged to partner with schools, school districts, educators, youth peer leaders, and educational support organizations to better understand adolescent tobacco use and co-develop and test tobacco prevention and cessation curricula for use in school settings. Many schools and school districts are particularly challenged to fully engage in community-partnered participatory research. Careful attention must be placed on the unique challenges in conducting research in the school environment. Having a teacher or school principal as a Community Co-PI is likely not feasible given the multiple demands and structure in schools; however, detailed efforts to overcome bureaucratic challenges can be described in the Research Plan if a research project will involve close collaboration with schools or school districts. A CBO that provides organizational support and services in educational settings might be better equipped to support school-based research

and provide staff leadership as a Community Co-PI. A letter of collaboration expressing willingness to collaborate from schools or their district should be included with application materials in the Appendix, as reviewers will assess the level of commitment and capacity of schools and school districts to engage in the proposed research.

Community Advisory Board

Each project is required to constitute a Community Advisory Board (CAB) consisting of a minimum of three representatives of the community(ies) the community of interest in the project. Information about already recruited CAB members and plans to recruit additional members must be entered on the Community Advisory Board template (2-page limit).

The purpose of the CAB is to provide feedback on all phases of the project, from early conceptualization to finalizing intervention development and implementation at the community level. The CAB should be comprised of individuals with expertise in tobacco control and other areas relevant to the project who can provide helpful feedback to the team on both community and scientific aspects of the project. Recruited CAB members must be named with a description of their organizational affiliation and proposed contribution for the project in relation to their role on the CAB. If designating CAB roles as yet to be determined (TBD), please describe areas of expertise your team will seek to recruit at a future time during the project.

One or more CAB members should represent the community of interest in the project. A CAB can provide feedback on 1) research questions; 2) recruitment plans; 3) survey questions or methods; 4) ethical considerations that will arise during the research project; 5) perspectives during data analysis and interpretation; 6) strategies to manage COVID-19 related impacts, and/or 7) non-traditional dissemination methods. There should be plans to evaluate engagement with your CAB to monitor and improve interactions with CAB members across the grant life cycle. For example, some teams periodically survey CAB members to determine if the meeting frequency and communication channels are helpful in keeping the CAB informed and receive feedback or to identify changes needed to keep members engaged over the course of the project. An approach that provides ongoing feedback on the strength of the partnership with the CAB and among CO-PIs is encouraged.

CPPR Rigor

The spirit of CPPR calls for the appropriate involvement of a community Co-PI and broader community at all stages of the research process. There must be genuine community involvement, and consideration should be given to the extent that members of the community of interest are represented on the research team and/or CAB. Community involvement should align with the capacity and expertise of members and organizations involved in the project. The ethical treatment of community members and their data is paramount. A detailed data sharing agreement plan should be prepared and described on the Collaborative Agreements form. The applicant team may contact the Program Officer who manages this grant type to discuss questions about the appropriate involvement of community members in a CPPRA application.

To support the scientific rigor of the CPPRA project, the applicant should not allow Co-Is, CAB members or anyone who is shaping and implementing the project to have conflicting roles. For example,

a CAB member should not be enrolled as a research participant. Research staff who are carrying out the project, whether they represent the community or academic perspective, should not also serve as research participants.

Partnership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement

The CPPRA team has an opportunity to describe (via the **Collaborative Agreements** form) how they will work together and share power, budget, resources, and outcomes with each other. In addition to the Community Co-PI and Academic Co-PI, the project team can include additional co-investigators, consultants, collaborators, mentors, students at all levels of training, and community residents at all educational levels to ensure there is culturally appropriate community and academic expertise on the team. Co-PIs should describe in their decision-making process plan how consensus or agreements will be reached for decisions that impact the research project. The team must ensure that the community and academic budgets are equitable and accurately reflect the effort contributed to the project by team members.

TRDRP values engagement with community residents and CBOs that translates to useful dissemination practices of community-partnered research findings and learning collaborative efforts for collective impact. It is imperative that applicant teams embed authentic community engagement at all levels of the research development process (from idea inception through dissemination and implementation activities). Consider innovative approaches to: support trainees from backgrounds that are underrepresented in research, support community-led efforts to redress tobacco-related health disparities affecting priority groups, and promote evidence-informed public health policy. Applicant teams do not need to limit their community engagement activities to disseminating the results of completed TRDRP-funded research. Funds can be used to support community engagement activities relevant to tobacco control and tobacco-related health equity; costs can be described in the project budget.

Dissemination and Sustainability

Applicant teams must develop a dissemination plan and a sustainability plan that is described in the Research Plan as part of the Pilot and Full CPPRA application package. There is a programmatic expectation for Pilot and Full CPPRAs to effectively disseminate research findings and lessons learned from the project; plans for periodic community debriefs where Co-PIs present findings to community members and/or CBOs through in-person meetings or webinars, or regularly writing project briefs that can be used in discussions with policy change makers and community members who can benefit from the findings. In addition, teams should describe the applicability of their research findings to other communities in California and include a plan for broader dissemination beyond their immediate community of interest in the project.

In the sustainability plan, efforts to continue the partnership activity after the life of the current phase of funding should be developed. Plans to evaluate the partnership over time can provide useful information on how to sustain the collaborative work. Early identification and utilization of community assets can also inform partnership sustainability and dissemination channels for findings. Plans for capacity building and maintenance on both sides of the partnership can be described in the proposal.

Cornelius Hopper Diversity Award Supplement (CHDAS)

One of TRDRP’s strategic objectives is to fund research that expands the pipeline of research trainees, community residents, and scholars engaged in tobacco prevention and treatment intervention in California. Newly-funded CPPRA grantee teams have the option to apply for a Cornelius Hopper Diversity Award Supplement (CHDAS) at the prefunding phase of the grant life cycle. This funding opportunity is available for CPPRA applications found meritorious after peer review and can be applied for during the pre-funding phase. The CHDAS support is intended to support trainees and California residents from underrepresented communities and/or those who wish to pursue careers in research focused on underserved communities. The CHDAS candidate or designee must be named and available to work on application materials in collaboration with at least one Co-PI on the CPPRA application, at the prefunding phase. All other CHDAS eligibility requirements also apply when submitting CHDAS paperwork during prefunding. The Supplement should support the designee’s initial entry into the field of tobacco-related research, including people without a degree, or within the stated TRDRP research priorities. We hope that community residents will find this funding opportunity a useful training vehicle to explore their own research interests at a deeper level, and expand the workforce of community scientists. The CHDAS application instructions, candidate template forms, and budget-related forms will be made available to CPPRA grantee teams during the pre-funding process. Please do not add CHDAS support to the Co-PI prime budgets, which have designated direct cost caps. The CHDAS support is on top of the direct cost cap for the prime budget research activities, and budget matters will be addressed after a team is notified of the funding status. More information about the CHDAS is located here: <https://trdrp.org/funding-opportunities/award-mechanisms/cornelius-hopper-diversity-supplement.html>.

Formatting Requirements and Important Reminders

Applicants who wish to apply for a CPPRA Pilot or Full grant must use the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) Research Grants Program Office (RGPO) SmartSimple grants management system (<https://rgpogrants.ucop.edu>).

Please review the “[SmartSimple TRDRP Application Submission Instructions](#)” for the technical instructions to submit a LOI and Full Application. All required fields in SmartSimple must be completed prior to submission of the LOI and Full Application. The sections noted below provide supplemental programmatic instruction to guide the content of your submission.

Formatting Requirements

Proposal templates (such as the Research Plan) can be downloaded from the Documentation tab of your full application in SmartSimple, after your LOI is approved. Please follow all formatting instructions listed at the top of each template.

Deviations from the page format, font size, specifications and page limitations, especially the page limit for the Research Plan, will be grounds for the TRDRP to reject and return the entire application without peer review.

Important Reminders

- Each Co-PI must be registered with SmartSimple (see [SmartSimple instructions](#)) and must select an institution with a tax ID (EIN) number.
- Other Documents Necessary to Review Prior to Submission: [TRDRP Call for Applications](#)— pertains to all award types.
- Technical Assistance is Available: For many community groups and scientific researchers, collaborations of this type are new and a bit confusing. Community groups may also be unfamiliar with the scientific research award process and the online application submission system. Please feel free to email trdrp@ucop.edu to request technical assistance. Our staff is not involved in the scoring process; any questions you ask will not affect the evaluation of your application in any way.

Letter of Intent Instructions

A letter of intent (LOI) is required for both the Pilot CPPRA and Full CPPRA grant types. It will be used to assess the application eligibility requirements for this grant type. The Community Co-PI or the Academic Co-PI can initiate the LOI process in SmartSimple (<https://rgpogrants.ucop.edu>). The Community Co-PI or Academic Co-PI must be identified at time of LOI submission; however, it is acceptable to identify one Co-PI after LOI submission. For example, the Community Co-PI can initiate and submit a LOI for programmatic review without an Academic Co-PI being listed, as long as there is a clear plan and timeline describing when the named Academic Co-PI will finalize their agreement to serve on the award. Both the Academic Co-PI and Community Co-PI must be named with organizational affiliation at time of submission of application materials for peer review.

Lay Abstract

Please use the following guidelines to write your Lay Abstract:

- **Lay Abstract:** This item is evaluated mainly in the programmatic review. **The text is also entered in the appropriate box in the “abstracts” page of the Proposal Sections.** Do not use symbols or other special text, as these will not transfer to the “abstracts” box. The **Lay Abstract** must include the following sections:
 - A **non-technical introduction** to the research topics
 - The **question(s) or central hypotheses** of the research in lay terms
 - The **general methodology** in lay terms
 - **Innovative elements and potential impact** of the project in lay terms

The abstract should be written using a style and language comprehensible to the general public. Avoid the use of acronyms and technical terms. The scientific level should be comparable to either a local newspaper or magazine article. Avoid the use of technical terms and jargon not a part of general usage. Place much less emphasis on the technical aspects of the background, approach, and methodology. If the partner of the submitting co-PI has been identified, include the name and organization in the abstract. This abstract should be revised jointly by the academic and community partners for the full application.

Full Application Instructions

Responses entered at the LOI stage will be automatically entered in the full application stage. Please review all of the pre-populated information, make updates or changes as necessary, and save the form(s).

Application Section: Project Information

Please use the following guidelines to differentiate the Scientific Abstract from the Lay Abstract (described in “Letter of Intent Instructions” section above):

- **Scientific Abstract:** This item is evaluated mainly in the peer review. Do not use symbols or other special text, as these will not transfer to the “abstracts” box.

The Scientific Abstract should include:

- A short introductory paragraph indicating the **background** and overall topic(s) addressed by the research project.
- The **central hypothesis** or **questions to be addressed** in the project.
- A listing of the **objectives or specific aims** in the research plan.
- The major research **methods and approaches** used to address the specific aims.
- A brief statement of the **impact** that the project will have on tobacco.

Provide the critical information that will integrate the research topic, its relevance to tobacco, the specific aims, the methodology, and the direction of the research in a manner that will allow a scientist to extract the maximum level of information. Make the abstract understandable without a need to reference the detailed research plan.

Application Section: Project Contacts

Project Personnel. Provide contact information and effort for ALL personnel on your project including the Applicant Co-Principal Investigators, Co-Investigator, Trainee, Collaborator, Consultant, and support personnel.

The applicant principal investigator should be listed with the role of “Applicant Principal Investigator” and the partner principal investigator should be listed with the role of the “Co-Principal Investigator.”

Upload biosketches to each of your Key Personnel members in this section, as shown in the SmartSimple instructions.

Application Section: Budget

Each institution that is a partner in the project must complete a budget. This means the Community Co-PI and the Academic Co-PI will each have their own Budget. If a collaborative partner on the project has a subcontract, then that subcontracting organization can complete a budget or the prime partner can complete the budget for the subcontracting organization.

Applicants should ensure that the direct costs on the Budget tab do not exceed the cap for each Co-PI on the award type.

Additional budget guidelines can be found in **Appendix B** of this document.

Application Section: Documentation

All required uploads are listed in the table below, and templates must be downloaded from the Documentation tab of SmartSimple. Templates must be completed, converted to PDF, and uploaded to your application, unless otherwise instructed.

Upload Item (Template/Form)	Page limit	Required or optional
Collaborative Agreements	3	Required
Community Advisory Board	2	Required
Biosketches (All Personnel listed on Key Personnel form)	5 (each biosketch)	Required
Facilities	1 per institution	Required
Research Plan	15 + references	Required
Human Subjects	No limit	Required
Vertebrate Animals	No limit	Optional
Appendix list and uploads	30	Optional

Detailed Description of Proposal Templates

1. Instructions – COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENTS

This form is used in Peer Review in part to score the “PARTNERSHIP” criteria.

Limit the text to three pages: To be collaboratively prepared by the Community and Academic Partners. Remove descriptive text to ensure sufficient space for a thorough response to each section.

The **Community Co-PI Applicant** is required to verify the decision process addressed in this form by submitting a statement that the governing body representing their Community-Based Organization (e.g., Board of Directors) has reviewed and approved this agreement or provide a copy of a Community Agency Resolution or the section of minutes from a meeting of the Community Co-PI’s governing body indicating their review and agreement with details outlined in the Collaborative Agreements form. The **Academic Co-PI Applicant** is responsible for ensuring the decision process addressed in this form is acceptable to and enforceable within their appointment at their research institution and is in accordance with policies at the research institution where they hold their appointment. A letter of commitment from a Department Chair or Director of Research at a non-university

research institute that speaks to the academic commitment of the research center to adhere to processes detailed in this form is recommended.

Ownership of Data. Describe the applicant team’s decision about who will own the data from this project, the timeliness within which data will be shared with their partner, acceptable uses of data from this proposed project, and intellectual property rights AND how the team derived the decision (i.e., what factors you considered, what was important to you in making this decision). If the applicant team decided that the data will be owned by only one of the collaborators, please consider that the need to continue to work together will likely extend well beyond the grant period. Will the partner who owns the data be willing to volunteer their time well after the grant period to provide access to the data for the other partner? Be sure to discuss ownership of identified and de-identified data, how IRB and the ethical treatment of participant data will be managed and include arrangements both partners have agreed to ensure access to the data by the other partner (including beyond the study period).

Handling Disagreements. Describe the process you will go through to manage disagreements that might arise during the study and afterwards. Occasionally, community-academic research teams have had to resolve issues around data ownership, conduct of the research, exclusion/inclusion criteria, addressing the needs of the community, cultural humility, dissemination of data and manuscript preparation for publication, administrative, timely payments, and other budget issues. Describe how your decision process and resolution plan will work for your team.

Plans for Broader Community Involvement in ALL phases of the Research Project. Describe how individual community members not on the research team or community-based organizations not directly overseeing the project (e.g., staff or board of a community agency) will or might be involved in the planning, conducting, evaluation, or dissemination of research activities and study findings. Describe how broader community participation will be managed by the co-principal investigators and research team.

Team Communication Plan. Describe the frequency and modes of communication that will be utilized to ensure the co-principal investigators stay abreast of the research progress and challenges when they arise. Describe how the Community Co-PI and their community organization will communicate with one another to facilitate input and decision-making. Describe how the Academic Co-PI and their research institution will communicate with one another to maintain buy-in and departmental support for the project and ensure the research adheres to institutional policies and best practices for academic research.

Decision-Making Process for Community and Academic Co-PIs. Develop and describe a multiple PI decision-making process and plan. Given there might be multiple co-investigators, consultants and collaborators, in addition to the Community Co-PI and Academic Co-PI, involved in the proposed community-partnered research project, it is imperative that a plan is in place that considers multiple perspectives from the research team and community advisory board and includes a process that can lead to a consensus, majority decision, or other decision process that is mutually agreed on. Describe how project-related decisions will be finalized. A decision-making process that clarifies whether consensus-making or another decisional framework will be used is recommended. Describe why the decision-making plan is well-suited for your research team and how it can contribute to the success of the project.

Plans for Turn-over of Personnel. Describe how the turn-over of personnel or temporary work departures at the community or academic sites will be handled. Describe how the Community Co-PI or Academic Co-PI will interact with their respective institutions if a temporary or permanent replacement is needed, and what steps will be taken to select a replacement Community Co-PI or Academic Co-PI. Please keep in mind that the replacement of the Community Co-PI, Academic Co-PI, community-based organization, or academic research institution will need to be approved by TRDRP in accordance with the process detailed in the Grants Administration Manual available on the RGPO website: <https://www.ucop.edu/research-grants-program/grant-administration/index.html>. TRDRP or RGPO does not oversee employment issues (e.g., hiring) for project staff.

Plans to Evaluate the Strength of the Research Partnership. Attention to building and strengthening community-academic research partnerships is critical to the success of community-based research and the longevity of the collaborative effort. Describe the strategy your team will implement to evaluate how the partnership develops over time. Issues to consider include frequency and method of communication; meeting location - will meetings be held in the community, university, both sites, or alternative locations; and frequency and method of sharing information. Consider creative evaluation tools that include qualitative, quantitative, and technology-driven information gathering methods and monitors changes in knowledge, attitudes, and behavior over time.

Plans for Dissemination of Findings. Dissemination of research findings to both the lay community and the scientific community is important to this research award. This is sometimes a difficult issue as scientific dissemination is often a lengthy process and may impede community dissemination or what information or deliverables a community needs from the project. Please describe what agreements have been made as to how research findings will be disseminated to both the community of interest and the scientific community and the expected timing of dissemination. The level of information presented in community settings needs to align with the strength of the evidence from the project or field.

Plans to Sustain the Research Partnership Beyond the Life of the Grant. Community-partnered participatory research requires consideration of the longer-term impact a community-academic collaborative research team can have in their community of interest. While challenging to know exactly how long the research partnership will last, describe, according to best intentions, how the research partnership could continue after the life of the current phase of funding, regardless if there are continued funds or no continued funding streams. Please consider that many multiple underserved communities in California have experienced research teams collecting their data, but not reporting back to the community nor using findings to improve health-related programs or policies in the community.

2. Instructions – COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD (CAB)

Limit the text to two pages.

The Co-PIs are to use the Community Advisory Board (CAB) application form to describe the composition of recruited CAB members at the time of application submission and members/expertise for future recruitment. Recruited CAB members must be named with a description of their organizational affiliation and proposed contribution to the project in relation to their role on the CAB. Co-PIs must list the names, organizational affiliations, and expertise of CAB members that have been confirmed at time of application submission and use the TBD designation when describing expertise proposed for future CAB member recruitment. It helps peer reviewers to link CAB-related duties and guidance to specific project activities and milestones. The applicant team may describe eligibility criteria used to recruit CAB members, how the team proposes to solicit input from the CAB, a communication style and evaluation framework, how frequently the CAB will be convened, whether payment or other incentives will be provided. Describe how the research partners plan to communicate and interact with CAB members. The communication between the applicant team and CAB should be evaluated or monitored with plans to modify as needed. An evaluation tool that monitors strengths and weaknesses of community-academic partnership development over time is recommended. The CAB does not have to be fully comprised at time of submission. A letter of collaboration from recruited CAB members or the CAB committee chair is recommended, if possible to obtain, and should be included in the Appendix section.

3. Instructions – BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Limit the text to five pages.

Complete a biographical sketch for each person listed in the Key Personnel section only, beginning with the co-principal investigators. To complete your biosketch, please use the template named “Biosketch Template” provided within SmartSimple and upload it in the Project Personnel section. Do not send reprints or manuscripts as part of this form.

4. Instructions – FACILITIES (Required for PILOT and FULL CPPRA Applicants)

Limit the text to one page per institution.

Briefly describe the facilities and resources (e.g., laboratory space, core facilities, major equipment, access to populations, statistical resources, animal care, and clinical resources for research awards or administrative space and equipment) that are needed and are available for successfully carrying out the proposed research. Make sure all of the research needs described in the research plan are addressed in this section. Describe resources to be supplied by subcontractors and those that are external to the institution.

5. Instructions – RESEARCH PLAN

Limit the text to 15 pages.

Page limits are exclusive of bibliographical references, which should follow the research plan.

Follow the formatting instructions in “General Items” above.

Both co-principal investigators’ names (last name, first name, middle initial) must be printed in the upper right-hand corner of every page.

We ask that applicants describe the proposed research project in sufficient detail for reviewers to evaluate its scientific merit and collaboration elements, as described below. If you don’t use all the pages to describe your research plan, it might be best to review what you have written and explain in more detail anything not fully explained. **However, note that a concise, focused research plan of less than the maximum number of pages is preferable to one less concise and made longer by overly elaborate or unimportant details.**

Supporting materials (such as sample survey items, consent forms, interview or focus group questions, letters of collaboration) that are directly relevant to the proposal may be included in the **Appendix. The research plan must be self-contained and understandable without having to refer extensively to supporting materials.**

Special Note: The content below is included to guide your thinking process when preparing the Research Plan. There is no requirement to address each topic or question, but rather it should inform the collaborative discussion among research team members. Addressing each topic does not guarantee your application will be funded. Applicant teams should focus on topics most relevant to their research question(s) and approach(es).

Statement of Goals, Research Questions, and Specific Aims. For **Pilot CPPRA** applications: In a brief paragraph, describe the goals and research question(s) that will be addressed over the pilot project timeline. Frame pilot research goals within long-term research goals that will be addressed in the later Full CPPRA funding phase. Describe how the Pilot CPPRA, if awarded, will be used to prepare the collaborative team to pursue further research and to apply for a TRDRP Full CPPRA award or funding from another agency. State the research question(s) for the project. Follow with the Specific Aims—the specific tasks and research-related activities that will be undertaken to address each research question. These should have a logical connection, and clear linkages

to the team’s long-term research goals. Do not include tasks that you expect to undertake in the Full CPPRA funding phase or with future funding from another agency.

For **Full CPPRA** applications: In a brief paragraph, describe the goals, research question(s) and hypothesis(es) for the Full CPPRA project. Follow with the Specific Aims —the specific tasks and research-related activities that will be undertaken to address each research question and hypothesis(es). The applicant team must describe how the current goals, research questions, and specific aims build on lessons learned from a pilot project or preliminary data collection effort.

Background, Significance, and Relevance to a Tobacco-Related Area. Describe the rationale underlying the proposed research and significance of the research question(s). Keep discussion of the general problem of tobacco-related health disparities brief; emphasize the specific health disparities/health equity problem addressed by your research proposal. Position the research in the context of existing relevant scientific literature and community knowledge on the tobacco-related issue and provide preliminary information that the team may have collected in preparing for the project. Demonstrate a grasp of the current scientific literature and community knowledge relevant to the tobacco-related problem. Provide up-to-date references, acknowledge controversies and contradictory reports, and be comprehensive and accurate. If there is little literature on the topic, draw on information from related fields. Discuss the importance and benefit to the community of addressing the research question(s) and achieving expected results. **Important for Full CPPRAs:** State the long-term potential of the research: the problems, issues, or questions which, through the execution of this award, can be further developed, specified, and sharpened into testable hypotheses; and the methodologic approach that is at present most appropriate to be used.

Preliminary Data (Required for the Full CPPRA Application). Describe in detail the work the applicant team performed during the Pilot CPPRA award or Pilot funding phase from another funder, if any, OR present relevant data or supporting information that is driving the proposed project. Include a description of different approaches taken, and the results obtained with each approach to justify applying for the Full CPPRA award. Present any data obtained in detail, with a description of how the data was obtained, analyzed, and where it was published or how it was disseminated to a community group. Describe any pitfalls or problems that arose, as well as how they were overcome. Provide justification and support for: (1) the hypothesis(es) and assumptions; (2) the research design; (3) the potential for useful knowledge and/or products to result from the research.

Research Plan: Research Design, Conceptual Framework, Approach, and Data Analysis Plan. Describe in detail the exact tasks associated with the Statement of Goals, Research Questions, and Specific Aims. Provide a detailed description of the work you will do during the Award period, exactly how it will be done, and by whom. Provide a theoretical or conceptual framework that informs the study design and research activities. Describe the methodology to be employed; how feasibility will be determined (i.e., what measures will be used to assess feasibility); if appropriate, the hypotheses to be investigated (**required for Full CPPRAs**); and the methodologic approach (or possible approaches that seem at present most appropriate to be used). For example, if adolescents are to be surveyed, explain how many adolescents will be surveyed; provide rationale supporting sample size(s); how adolescents will be identified and recruited; why you believe you will be able to reach and recruit the estimated number of adolescents; what questions you will ask them; whether you will use face-to-face, social media, or telephone interviews, or written surveys and why you will use the method chosen; and, how the data will be collected and analyzed. Be as detailed and rigorous as possible. Provide this information for each specific research activity. Discuss potential pitfalls and how you will overcome them if they occur, or alternative methods that you will use if the intended methods are not fully realized. Provide a realistic timeline. Clearly state a collaborative data analysis plan that will adequately address the Specific Aims. Include milestones, with quantifiable measures, anticipated over the course of the research project. Demonstrate that the research design is aligned and consistent with the capacity and expectations of the target community and community-based organization (e.g., whether a randomized controlled trial design violates community or community-based organization norms or is deemed acceptable). Consider how social and structural determinants of health can

reasonably be expected to impact the project from a health equity perspective, and what the research team can do to mitigate them. Describe pandemic-related mitigation factors that will be used to promote the health and safety of all people involved in the project. For **Full CPPRAs**, applicant teams must explicitly describe a tobacco prevention intervention or tobacco treatment intervention that they plan to develop, test, evaluate, and/or implement over the course of the Full CPPRA project timeline.

Partnership Collaboration Plan. Begin this section by describing the community of interest for the project. Is the community distinct because of geography, age, biological sex, gender identity, disease status or risk, race or ethnicity, sexual orientation, or socioeconomic status? Describe the community interest and their expected contribution to the proposed research project, if funded. Describe the relationship between the Community Co-PI and their community organization and the community of interest. How will the community of interest be represented on the research team and Community Advisory Board? Discuss how the leadership of the community organization (e.g., the Executive Director, the Board of Directors, or the individuals of an organization) will ensure that the organization or group stays committed to the research project?

Describe in detail the plan for carrying out the collaborative research partnership. Describe your specific collaboration plans, including how and when the partners will interact; what the specific roles and responsibilities of each partner will be through each step of the research process; how all members will be brought into the design, data analysis, and decision-making process. Briefly summarize how the collaborative agreements (e.g., ownership of data, handling disagreements, process describing how project-related decisions will be finalized) described in more detail in the **Collaborative Agreements** plan will contribute to strengthening the partnership, the successful completion of Study Aims, and other project objectives.

Potential for the Proposed Work to Benefit the Community and Lead to an Intervention. While it is challenging to know the outcomes of the research project, please consider and describe the potential for the proposed research activity to benefit the community of interest and contribute to a tobacco prevention or treatment intervention or how the work can inform future policy efforts. Describe how the research partnership and findings could reduce tobacco-related health disparities, promote health equity, or benefit a priority population in California. Describe how the community participants or residents, academic institutions or community-based organizations, and the community scientists involved in the project will likely benefit from the anticipated outcomes of the proposed research. Discuss how participating in this research project will build capacity for the community organization (such as through: developing research/evaluation skills, answering a question important to the organization, training students and community residents in job skills related to research to expand the pipeline of community scientists in tobacco control, informing public health policy, improving programs or services), as well as build capacity at the academic institution and among academic investigators (e.g., demonstrating the value of community-partnered participatory research for faculty development, increasing faculty interest in a program of research focused on community-partnered participatory scholarly work, expanding the pipeline of community-based scientists, or justifying university resources for community-based research).

Dissemination Approaches and Sustainability Plan. Describe how the research partnership and findings will be broadly distributed and applicable to communities in California and how the community will be involved in interpreting study outcomes. Describe efforts that will ensure the partnership activity will likely continue after the current phase of funding. For **Pilot CPPRA's**, if the aims of the pilot are achieved, describe plans for follow-on activities, such as plans to prepare and submit a Full CPPRA grant application, application for another funding agency, plans to improve tobacco-related services or programming, or steps to routinely inform the community on outcomes of the study or build from where the study ends for community benefit. For **Full CPPRAs**, the applicant team should have plans to disseminate information to a community group and include a sustainability plan for promising practices derived from the research activity.

Investigative Team. Describe how the experience, knowledge, and skills of the research team can contribute to the success of the overall project. Provide evidence that the co-principal investigators and other key personnel are

appropriately trained and well-suited to carry out the research. Be clear about the roles and responsibilities of the research partners. Highlight experience and successes working with the community of interest. Describe what is expected to be learned by the collaborative research team during the study.

Environment, Facilities, and Resource Availability. Describe how the community locations for the project will contribute to the success of the research project. Highlight resources and access that the Community Co-PI and community-based organizations will provide that will encourage success of the project. Demonstrate awareness of relevant social and structural determinants of health factors that might impact the environment in which the project is conducted. Demonstrate readiness to adjust research activities for situations where community facilities and resources are not fully available to the team for the duration of the project or because of COVID-19 issues. Describe resources available through the Academic Co-PI's institution that will uniquely benefit the project. Demonstrate access to the research population of interest.

Community Assets. Describe community-level assets, strengths, and access channels the applicant team proposes to utilize over the course of the study or during the dissemination phase. Describe how the project will contribute to building capacity in the community of interest for future research, tobacco control policy change, or programming activities. Provide evidence of credibility of the partnering community-based organization within the community of interest, a track record of success in delivering services or programs in the community, and representation by the community or priority population of interest within the organization.

Statement of Future Goals. Begin with a brief discussion of the long-term partnership goals and research goals, as well as a description of the work the team would like to pursue with future funding from TRDRP or another funder. For **Pilot CPPRAs**, describe how the research findings from the pilot could potentially inform future interventions focused on tobacco prevention or cessation, efforts to inform policymakers, or improvements in tobacco-related services and programs. For **Full CPPRAs**, describe future plans to continually update and improve the efficacy or effectiveness of the tobacco prevention or treatment intervention developed during the Full CPPRA funding phase. Be as specific as possible about future research plans.

Literature Cited (No Page Limit for this Section). List relevant references. Each reference must include the title, names of all authors, book or journal, volume number, page numbers, and year of publication. The references should be limited to relevant and current literature. Be concise and select only those literature references pertinent to the proposed research.

6. Instructions – HUMAN SUBJECTS

This form is required for all applications but only needs to be completed if the proposed study will involve human subjects.

Special Note to CPPRA Applicants: If you are planning on having data from your studies with individual identifiers being accessible and possibly even maintained by both the Community Research Partner and the Academic Research Partner, please address this issue in your Human Subjects approval application. If you received Human Subjects approval through one partner's IRB, and you did not include in the IRB application that the other partner will receive a copy of the identified data during or after the study, you may be precluded from sharing the data.

Provide sufficient information in response to item (1) below to confirm there has been a determination that the designated exemptions are appropriate. Determination of exemption from DHHS regulations must be made by an approved Institutional Review Board (IRB). Documentation of IRB review must be provided before an award is made. Research designated exempt is discussed in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public

Health Service Grant Application #398 Part II Supplemental Instructions for Preparing the Human Subjects Section of the Research Plan, Pages 4-5. Although a grant application is *exempt* from these regulations, it must, nevertheless, **address the issues of racial/ethnic composition of the subject population**, as instructed in item (2) below.

If your proposal will involve human subjects, and you have not applied for or received an exemption, you must address the seven points below. In addition, when research involving human subjects will take place at collaborating site(s) or other performance site(s) provide this information before discussing the seven points. Although no specific page limitation applies to this section, be succinct.

1. Provide a detailed description of the proposed involvement of human subjects in the work outlined in the research plan.
2. Describe the characteristics of the subject population, including its anticipated number, age range, and health status. It is the policy of the State of California, the University of California, and the TRDRP that research involving human subjects must include males, females, and members of minority groups in study populations. Applicants must describe how racial/ethnic minorities will be included as research participants and identify the criteria for inclusion or exclusion of any sub-population. If this requirement is not satisfied, the rationale must be clearly explained and justified. For example, adequate inclusion of minorities as subjects in research studies may be impossible or inappropriate with respect to the purpose of the research, due to the health of the subjects, or for other legitimate scientific reasons. Also explain the rationale for the involvement of special classes of subjects, if any, such as fetuses, pregnant women, children, prisoners, other institutionalized individuals, or others who are likely to be vulnerable. Applications without such documentation are ineligible for funding and will not be evaluated. It is not necessary in this application to document inclusion of women.
3. Identify the sources of research material obtained from individually identifiable living human subjects in the form of specimens, records, or data. Indicate whether the material or data will be obtained specifically for research purposes or whether use will be made of existing specimens, records, or data.
4. Describe the plans for recruiting subjects and the consent procedures to be followed, including: the circumstances under which consent will be sought and obtained and who will seek it, the nature of the information to be provided to the prospective subjects, and the method of documenting consent. State if the IRB has authorized a modification or waiver of the elements of consent or the requirement for documentation of consent.
5. Describe any potential risks (physical, psychological, social, legal, or other) and assess their likelihood and seriousness. Where appropriate, describe alternative treatments and procedures that might be advantageous to the subjects.
6. Describe the procedures for protecting against, or minimizing, any potential risks (including risks to confidentiality), and assess their likely effectiveness. Where appropriate, discuss provisions for ensuring necessary medical or professional intervention in the event of adverse effects on the subjects. Also where appropriate, describe the provision for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of subjects.
7. Discuss why the risks are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits to subjects and in relation to the importance of knowledge that may be reasonably expected to result. If a test article (investigational new drug [IND], device, or biologic) is involved, name the test article and state whether the IND has been obtained.

Documentation of Assurances for Human Subjects. In the Appendix to your application, include official documentation of the approval by the IRBs of all participating institutions, if available at the time of submission, showing the title of this application, the principal investigators' names, and the inclusive approval dates; do not include supporting protocols. IRB approval is not required at time of application submission.

Approvals obtained under a different title, investigator, or organization are not acceptable, unless they cross-reference the proposed project. Even if there is no applicant institution (i.e., an individual PI is the responsible applicant) and there is no institutional performance site, a USPHS-approved IRB must provide the assurance. If review is pending, please note that and send the final assurance as soon as possible to TRDRP. Funds will not be released until all assurances are received by the TRDRP. If the research organization(s) where the work with human subjects will take place is different than the applicant organization, approvals from the boards of each will be required.

7. Instructions – VERTEBRATE ANIMALS

This form is required **ONLY** for applications involving vertebrate animals. Please refer to the TRDRP [2024 Call for Core Applications](#) Appendix E if you require additional information on Vertebrate Animals.

8. Instructions – APPENDIX COVER SHEET

The research plan must be self-contained and understandable without having to refer to the appendix. Only those materials necessary to facilitate the evaluation of the research plan may be included; the appendix is not to be used to circumvent page limitations of the application. No supplemental materials are allowed after the submission deadline unless requested by the TRDRP. While there are no page limits for the appendix, we strongly recommend that the appendix be no more than 30 pages in length.

ALL APPENDIX MATERIALS will need to be “uploaded” to the SmartSimple website (so therefore in PDF format). If the applicant plans to attach print materials (brochures, handbooks, etc.) they are advised to begin preparing those documents in uploadable formats well before the application deadline.

Community Agency Resolution. Provide a copy of a resolution or the section of minutes from a meeting of the Community Applicant governing body (Board of Directors for a nonprofit organization or the individuals responsible for organizing an informal organization) indicating their review and agreement with the details outlined on the Collaborative Agreements form. The resolution or minutes should include the date of approval and should be signed by an officer of the organization.

Letters of Support and Letters of Collaboration can be important in showing support for the research project from community stakeholders. The letters should be as specific as possible in describing the specific involvement of the individual or organization in designing the research project or the anticipated involvement in working with the research team in carrying out their role on the project. General letters of support, without addressing the specific involvement of the individual or organization in the research project, are not as important as letters of collaboration, showing anticipated involvement in the project.

ALL LETTERS SHOULD BE COMBINED INTO ONE PDF DOCUMENT; DO NOT UPLOAD INDIVIDUAL LETTERS OF COLLABORATION.

Supporting Documents. Supporting materials (such as questionnaires, consent forms, interview questions) that

are directly relevant to the proposal may be included in the Appendix. Note that the research plan must be self-contained and understandable without having to refer to the Appendix. Only those materials necessary to facilitate the evaluation of the research plan may be included; the Appendix is not to be used to circumvent page limitations. Please itemize materials on the Appendix Cover Sheet.

Resubmission Guidelines. Submission of a revised pilot or full CPPRA application from Cycle 33 (2023 cycle) is allowed in the 2024 cycle. A grant application submitted under a different grant type cannot be a resubmit for the CPPRA grant type.

Appendix A: Resources to Understand Community-Partnered Participatory Research

It is critical that community and academic Co-PIs fully understand what it means to do CPPR research. Colleagues entrenched in this work fully grasp the importance of humanity, cultural humility, active listening skills, moving through work processes in a slow and purposeful way, and the gentle conversations that help leaders reach consensus on the expectations and approaches used when working across diverse community groups.

The literature references in this section are included to provide examples of the types of successful CPPR conducted in the United States. Materials listed below do not comprise the totality of issues to consider when conducting CPPR through authentic community-academic partnership. This is included to provide examples of equitable power sharing across the research process, how community benefit from research can be described in a publication, evaluation approaches of community-academic partnerships, and to convey the spirit of this type of research.

- A. The National Academy of Medicine (NAM; <https://nam.edu/>) has supported the development of a conceptual model to inform an equity-forward approach to community engaged scholarship. The concepts in this model are responsive to TRDRP's conceptualization of CPPR and includes helpful concepts for consideration by CPPRA applicant teams. Applicants for this grant type are encouraged to review the NAM's Achieving Health Equity and Systems Transformation through Community Engagement Conceptual Model, which is located here: <https://nam.edu/programs/value-science-driven-health-care/achieving-health-equity-and-systems-transformation-through-community-engagement-a-conceptual-model/>.
- B. The [community-partnered participatory research \(CPPR\) model](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4841676/) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4841676/> was developed by Healthy African American Families, with the support of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science.
- C. The academic journal *Ethnicity & Disease* has multiple examples of CPPR reported in publications in their [Volume 28 \(2018\) supplement 2: Advances in Community-Partnered Participatory Research: Behavioral Health and Beyond](https://www.ethndis.org/edonline/index.php/ethndis/issue/view/34). You can view all publications for free (open access) in this special supplement <https://www.ethndis.org/edonline/index.php/ethndis/issue/view/34>.
- D. *Ethnicity & Disease* has also released [Volume 31 \(2021\), Supplement 1 -Structural Racism and Discrimination: Impact on Minority Health and Health Disparities](https://ethndis.org/edonline/index.php/ethndis/issue/view/54) <https://ethndis.org/edonline/index.php/ethndis/issue/view/54> which is particularly relevant to CPPRA applications aiming to address social structural determinants of health.

The articles found at the above links are not exhaustive for CPPR-based scholarship or frameworks to advance community science. Other readings relevant to collaborative research partnerships also pertain to this award type and should be considered in a thoughtfully designed research plan.

Appendix B: Cost and Expense Guidelines

1) *Personnel*

The Budget Summary line item for Personnel should reflect the total cost of all individuals identified as supported by the grant and their level of effort. In the personnel section of the application, be sure to name all individuals to be supported by the grant and provide their percent effort (months devoted to the project). All paid individuals must also be listed on the budget.

Follow the NIH Guidelines and Calculation scheme for determining Months Devoted to Project, available at the links below:

- NIH Guidelines: <https://grants.nih.gov/faqs#/person-months.htm>
- NIH Calculation Scheme: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/person_months_conversion_chart.xls

When computing salary for key personnel, use only the base salary at the applicant organization, excluding any supplementary income (e.g., clinical or consulting incomes). TRDRP does not enforce a salary cap, as long as the overall budget adheres to the costs & expenses guidelines and the amount requested stays within the allowable costs.

2) *Student Tuition Fees, Graduate Student Stipends*

For non-fellowship awards: Graduate students may be paid as personnel and may receive full tuition and fee remission (up to \$50,000) and compensation in line with the relevant collective bargaining agreement. Stipends may not exceed \$60,000 per project year. Stipend may be budgeted as salary (and included in the MTDC cost calculation) if the institution pays these expenses through a personnel line item. Tuition remission will be considered compensation and should not offset other financial aid. Undergraduate stipends and tuition and fee remission will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

3) *Other Project Expenses*

Include expected costs for supplies and other research expenses not itemized elsewhere.

Pooled expenses may be allowed as a direct cost at the discretion of the Program with certification of the following: 1) the project will be directly supported by the pooled expenses, 2) the pooled expenses have been specifically excluded from the indirect cost rate negotiation, and 3) the pooled expenses have been allocated consistently over time within the organization. Please explain any requested pooled expense requests in the budget justification.

4) *Equipment (Unit Cost over \$5,000)*

For all Awards, each requested equipment item must be >\$5,000 and explained in the budget justification.

5) *Travel*

Travel – TRDRP Meeting: TRDRP may organize an event requiring your travel to the Oakland area within the funded grant period. Funds up to \$750 should be set aside for attending the TRDRP-organized meeting during the first year of the grant. All applicants, including fellowship applicants, should budget a one-time \$750 expense under year 1 in a travel budget line labeled: "Travel - TRDRP Meeting".

Travel - Project Related: Project-related travel expenses are allowable only for travel directly related to the execution of the proposed research activities. Label such expenses as “Travel – Project Related.” These expenses must be fully justified in the budget justification.

Travel - Scientific Meetings: Scientific conference travel is limited to \$2,000 per year (excluding a mandatory allocation of \$750 in one year of the project for travel to the TRDRP Conference under Travel - RGPO Meeting). The same limit applies to Fellowship recipients. Label such expenses as “Travel-Scientific Meetings” and explain in budget justification.

6) Service Contracts and Consultants

Both categories require additional description (Budget Justification).

7) Subcontracts

Detailed contractual budgets must be included as a subcontractor budget in the database, and letters of collaboration from each subcontract must be included in the Appendix. A subcontract is not allowed to have another subcontract.

In the case of University of California applicants, subcontracts need to be categorized and broken out as one of two types, University of California-to-University of California (UC to UC) sub agreements or transfers; or, Other. A subcontract is not allowed to have another subcontract. Requires additional description (Budget Justification).

8) INDIRECT (F&A) COSTS

Indirect cost policy: Indirect costs are NOT allowed for Postdoctoral Fellowship Awards, Predoctoral Fellowship Awards, Student Research Supplement Awards, or Cornelius Hopper Diversity Award Supplements. For other awards, non-UC institutions are entitled to full F&A of the Modified Total Direct Cost base (MTDC); UC institutional F&A is capped at 40% MTDC (25% for off-campus projects).

Modified Total Direct Costs (MTDC) include salaries and wages, fringe benefits, materials and supplies, services, travel, and up to the first \$25,000 of each subgrant or subcontract (regardless of the period covered by the subgrant or subcontract) to an outside institution. MTDC does not include (indirect costs are not allowed on): capital expenditures, charges for patient care, scholarships and fellowships (including postdoctoral stipends), tuition remission and graduate student stipends, rental costs of space, equipment purchases more than \$5,000 per item, the portion of each sub grant and subcontract in excess of the first \$25,000, and the total cost of any subcontract from one UC to another UC campus. On a non-fellowship award, you may apply indirect costs to graduate student salary (under salary only, not as stipend) but not to tuition & fees.

For all eligible projects that allow grantees to recover the full amount of their federally negotiated indirect cost rate agreement, grantees must also accept the full federally recognized F&A rate for all award subcontractors (except for subcontracts to another UC institution, where F&A is not allowed). If a grantee or subcontractor does not have a federally negotiated F&A rate at the time of the proposal submission, the grantee and/or subcontractor may estimate what the federally negotiated rate will be at the time of award and include this rate in the proposed

budget, or may request a “De Minimis” F&A rate of 25% MTDC. A higher indirect rate that has been accepted for state or local government contract or other California grantmaker contract may be approved at the discretion of the Program Director and the Research Grants Program Office Executive Director.

Indirect Costs on Subcontracts

- The award recipient institution will pay indirect costs to the subcontractor.
- For non-UC subcontracted partners, TRDRP will allow full F&A of the Modified Total Direct Cost (MTDC), as defined above.
- F&A costs are not allowed for one UC institution's management of a subcontract to another UC institution.

The amount of the subcontracted partner’s F&A costs can be added to the direct costs cap of any award mechanism that allows subcontracts. Thus, the direct costs portion of the grant to the recipient institution may exceed the award mechanism cap by the amount of the F&A costs to the subcontracted partner’s institution.

Appendix C: Other Application-Related Policies, Pre & Post Award Requirements

Submission Process

Submission of a Letter of Intent (LOI) is required to apply for all award mechanisms. The LOI must be submitted electronically. LOI submission instructions should be strictly followed as stated. LOIs will be programmatically reviewed to ensure eligibility after the August 24, 2023, deadline and applicants will be notified whether they are eligible to submit a full application approximately 10 days after submission.

All applicants should review the Call for Applications and [SmartSimple Submission Instructions](#) in their entirety, and must complete all necessary materials using the appropriate templates and forms. Failure to comply with provided instructions or submission of incomplete forms may result in administrative rejection of the application.

Review Process and Funding Decisions

Applications will be grouped by priority area and undergo peer-review by experts from outside of California. The criteria for evaluating applications are described under each specific award mechanism section. TRDRP and its Scientific Advisory Committee will prioritize funding scientifically meritorious applications that are well-aligned with the priority areas described in this Call for Applications, which provide a balance across these priorities, and that are within the extent of funding that is available.

For more information about the funding process visit the [TRDRP website](http://trdrp.org/funding-opportunities/review-process/index.html) (trdrp.org/funding-opportunities/review-process/index.html).

Resubmission Policy

A resubmission is an unfunded application that was submitted to TRDRP as a new application in the previous cycle (i.e., 2023) and resubmitted under the current Call for Applications (i.e., 2024). TRDRP will accept only a single resubmission of the same or very similar project, regardless of change in application title. Resubmissions are only allowed once and must be submitted in the subsequent Call for Applications.

Applicants are still required to inform TRDRP of their intent to resubmit through an LOI submission and must note it as a resubmission (please refer to the [SmartSimple Submission Instructions](#) for the specific award mechanisms). All other applications are considered new applications.

Multiple Submissions Policy

Researchers can submit more than one application, provided that the proposed research topics and aims are significantly different for each LOI/application.

TRDRP Eligibility Criteria

Investigators from California not-for-profit organizations are eligible for TRDRP funding, including but not limited to colleges, universities, hospitals, laboratories, research institutions, local health departments, community-based organizations, voluntary health agencies, health maintenance organizations and tobacco control organizations. The sponsoring institution, in accordance with its own policies and procedures, should designate

the principal investigator (PI). The PI must supervise the research project and any trainees directly and in person. U.S. citizenship is not a requirement for eligibility.

Applicants at California-based Nonprofit Institutions

TRDRP will accept applications from PIs at non-profit organizations or institutions, provided that the organization can manage the grant and demonstrate sound financial stewardship. NOTE: The organization must also meet our liability insurance requirements; please contact the appropriate [Program Officer](#) for more information. If the application is recommended for funding, the centralized business units within the Research Grants Program Office (RGPO) will collect additional information, such as tax ID numbers and financial reports, to review the organization during the pre-funding process to ensure all financial management and project management eligibility criteria can be met.

Condition of Award for UC Faculty on payroll at a non-UC entity

In accord with University of California policy, investigators who are University employees and who receive any part of their salary through the University must submit grant proposals through their campus contracts and grants office (“Policy on the Requirement to Submit Proposals and to Receive Awards for Grants and Contracts through the University”, Office of the President, December 15, 1994). Exceptions must be approved by the UC campus where the investigator is employed.

Human Material and Animal Subjects

Approvals for use of human material and animal research subjects are not required at the time of application. Applicants are encouraged to apply to the appropriate board or committee as soon as possible in order to expedite the start of the project, and you must do so before or within 21 days of notification that an award has been offered. This deadline may be negotiable depending on the circumstances of the proposal. If all reasonable efforts are not made to obtain appropriate approvals in a timely fashion, funds may be reallocated to other potential grantees' proposed research projects.

Appeals of Funding Decisions:

An appeal regarding the funding decision of a grant application may be made only on the basis of an alleged error in, or deviation from, a stated procedure (e.g., undeclared reviewer conflict of interest or mishandling of an application). The period open for the appeal process is within 30 days of receipt of the application evaluation from the Program office. Before submitting appeals, applicants are encouraged to talk about their concerns informally with the appropriate program officer or the TRDRP program director.

Final decisions on application funding appeals will be made by the vice president of Research and Innovation, University of California, Office of the President. Applicants who disagree with the scientific review evaluation are invited to submit revised applications in a subsequent grant cycle with a detailed response to the review.

The full appeals policy can be found online in the University of California, Office of the President, “RGPO Grant Administration Manual – Section 5: Dispute Resolution”:

https://www.ucop.edu/research-grants-program/files/documents/srp_forms/srp_gam.pdf

Pre-Funding Requirements

Upon request, awardees must supply the following information or documents:

1. Supply approved indirect (F&A) rate agreements as of the grant's start date and any derived budget calculations.
2. A copy of the organization's Certificate of Insurance. Contact the appropriate Program Officer for details on insurance requirements.
3. Supply any missing application forms or materials, including detailed budgets and justifications for any subcontract(s).
4. IRB or IACUC applications or approvals pertaining to the award.
5. Resolution of any scientific overlap issues with other grants or pending applications.
6. Resolution of any Review Committee and Program recommendations, including specific aims, award budget, or duration.
7. Modify the title and lay abstract, if requested.

Publications Acknowledgement and Open Access

All scientific publications and other products from a research project funded by one of the programs in the UC Research Grant Program Office (RGPO), such as TRDRP, must acknowledge the funding support from UC Office of the President, with reference to TRDRP and the assigned grant ID number.

RGPO is committed to disseminating research as widely as possible to promote the public benefit. All publications based on funding received from RGPO are subject to the University's Open Access Policy which went into effect on April 22, 2014. To assist the RGPO in disseminating and archiving the articles, the grantee institution and all researchers on the grant will deposit an electronic copy of all publications in UC Publication Management System, UC's open access repository, promptly after publication. Notwithstanding the above, this policy does not in any way prescribe or limit the venue of publication. The full policy is available here:

<https://www.ucop.edu/research-grants-program/grant-administration/rgpo-open-access-policy.html>

Grant Management Procedures and Policies

All TRDRP grant recipients must abide by other pre- and post-award requirements pertaining to Cost Share, Indirect Cost Rates, Monitoring & Payment of Subcontracts, Conflict of Interest, Disclosure of Violations, Return of Interest, Equipment and Residual Supplies, Records Retention, Open Access, and Reporting as outlined in the Grants Administration Manual (GAM) available at the link below:

http://www.ucop.edu/research-grants-program/files/documents/srp_forms/srp_gam.pdf