

1. What did your SPN do to develop or promote development of junior (especially minority) researchers at your organization?

■ Developed a program specifically targeted to minority Junior Investigators

- Faculty Diversity and Community Outreach (FDCO)
 - Mentoring
 - Research Training
 - Career Development
 - Community Partners

- Community Based Organization
 - Community Researchers
 - Strong skills development
 - Community IRB

1a. How has this benefited the institution and community?

- Significant increase in the number of underrepresented minority faculty investigators
 - In 1999, 10 African-American and 8 Hispanic
 - In 2004, 24 African-American and 27 Hispanic
 - Increased Pilot Projects and NIH Minority Supplement Grants
- Increase in the number of community-based participatory research projects
 - Stipends to community people
 - Community-driven research focus
 - Undergraduate student/Junior College involvement

1b. What evidence shows these benefits?

- Increased research dollars
- Increased pool of minority investigators
- Stronger academic-community partnerships
- Increased tenure-track minority faculty

2. What lessons have been learned?

- More extensive training for Junior Investigators
- Maintain a database of Junior Investigators
- Recruit Junior Investigators early in the grant cycle
- Use Junior Investigators who are in the community
- Keep community members informed on the progress of the Pilots
- Maintain contact with the Principal Investigators of unfunded Pilots

3. What happened that was not expected, and how did your SPN respond?

- Unexpectedly large response from Junior Investigators for the Technical Assistance Workshops
- Time lag between award notice and funding availability
 - Compromises momentum for research and training
 - Community loses confidence: “the thrill is gone”
- Cautionary response initially from Ministers and CBOs
- Not all Junior Investigators are interested in cancer research
- Information-flow bottlenecks

3. What happened that was not expected and how did your SPN respond? (cont'd)

■ Indirect costs

- Should be addressed at the national level
- Deter Junior Investigators from universities that also require indirect cost
- Once “double dipping” occurs, there are limited funds available to do the work

■ Reimbursement

- Initial outlay of funds deters research activity
- This information was not made known in advance

4. What are your SPN's best practices/accomplishments?

■ Mentoring Model

- Target approach
- Assessment-based
- Chairman-level support

■ Pre-grant preparation process

- Intensive grant-writing skills
- IRB training
- How to respond to the RFA

■ Partnership roundtable

- Institutional partners
- Community partners
- Stakeholders

4a. What would you replicate or do again?

- Include undergraduate students, graduate students, post-docs, and junior faculty
- Youth-training objectives: needs and resources
 - Long-term for graduate students
 - Short-term for interns and fellows
- WebX training and distance learning
 - Staff to be extended partners
 - RFA listserv

4b. What would you not do again?

- Go directly to communities without first engaging community leaders
- Initiate community involvement before locating an IRB
- Initiate research before receiving preliminary funds (e.g., seed money)

5. How does the community perceive your SPN and your institution/organization?

- Some communities may perceive us as focusing on a limited pool of potential research contributors
- Improve follow-up and maintain a commitment to the community for research outcomes and career development
- Improve efforts to engage existing infrastructure: local health departments, AHECS, CHCs, etc.
- Gain trust through collaborations with technical and community leaders

5. How does the community perceive your SPN and your institution/organization? (cont'd)

- Be aware of and appropriately compensate CBOs based on their priorities when fulfilling your research requirements