

K Awards

K01: Mentored Research Scientist Career Development Award

For support of a postdoctoral or early career research scientists committed to research, in need of both advanced research training and additional experience. The purpose of the NIH Mentored Research Scientist Development Award (K01) is to *provide support and “protected time” (3-5 years) for an intensive, supervised career development experience* in the biomedical, behavioral, or clinical sciences leading to research independence. **Must be US citizen. PhD.**

K08: Mentored Clinical Scientist Research Career Development Award

To provide the opportunity for promising clinician scientists with demonstrated aptitude to develop into independent investigators, or for faculty members to pursue research, and aid in filling the academic faculty gap in health profession's institutions. The purpose of this program is to prepare clinically trained individuals for careers that have a significant impact on the health-related research needs of the Nation. This program provides *support and protected time for an intensive, supervised research career development experience* in the fields of biomedical, behavioral, or clinical research, including translational research. **Must be US citizen. MD or MD-PhD.**

K99: Pathway to Independence Award

To support both an *initial mentored research experience (K99) followed by independent research (R00) for highly qualified, postdoctoral researchers, to secure an independent research position.* Award recipients are expected to compete successfully for independent R01 support during the R00 phase. The purpose of this program is to increase and maintain a strong cohort of new and talented, NIH-supported, independent investigators. This program is designed to facilitate a timely transition of outstanding postdoctoral researchers or clinician-scientists from mentored research positions to independent, tenure-track or equivalent faculty positions, and to provide independent NIH research support during the transition that will help these individuals launch competitive, independent research careers.

No more than 4 years of postdoc. Do not need to be US citizen. PhD, MD, or MD-PhD.

K Awards Success Rates at NIAMS

Fiscal Year	K01				K08				K99			
	Number of Applications Reviewed	Number of Applications Awarded	Success Rate ²	Total Funding ³	Number of Applications Reviewed	Number of Applications Awarded	Success Rate ²	Total Funding ³	Number of Applications Reviewed	Number of Applications Awarded	Success Rate ²	Total Funding ³
2008	25	6	24%	\$732,037	25	13	52%	\$1,607,147	21	3	14%	\$258,469
2009	23	9	39%	\$1,048,734	16	9	56%	\$1,080,456	23	5	22%	\$368,528
2010	29	10	34%	\$1,151,485	17	9	53%	\$1,026,942	24	4	17%	\$350,874
2011	30	8	27%	\$960,290	19	8	42%	\$967,523	30	3	10%	\$271,663
2012	36	14	39%	\$1,581,448	16	9	56%	\$1,080,528	31	5	16%	\$459,155
2013	24	7	29%	\$794,687	14	8	57%	\$973,001	21	3	14%	\$258,625
2014	42	12	29%	\$1,420,671	17	8	47%	\$1,009,380	21	3	14%	\$266,135
2015	34	9	26.5%	\$1,053,118	23	8	34.8%	\$991,845	19	3	15.8%	\$292,788
2016	46	9	19.6%	\$1,113,152	18	11	61.1%	\$1,824,472	28	4	14.3%	\$368,442
2017	39	12	30.8%	\$1,516,248	19	7	36.8%	\$1,208,295	22	5	22.7%	\$460,636
10 year average	33	10	29.79%	\$1,137,187.00	18	9	49.64%	\$1,176,958.90	24	4	16.02%	\$335,531.50

Main Components of a K Grant

Project Summary

Project Narrative

References Cited

Facilities and Other Resources

Equipment

Biosketches

Budget

Candidate Information and Career Development Goals

Specific Aims

Research Strategy

Training in Responsible Conduct

Plans and Statements of Mentor and Co-Mentors

Institutional Commitment to Candidate's Research Career

Human Subjects

Vertebrate Animals

Authentication of Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources

Main Components of a K Grant

Project Summary

Project Narrative

References Cited

Facilities and Other Resources

Equipment

Biosketches

Budget

Candidate Information and Career Development Goals

Specific Aims

Research Strategy

Training in Responsible Conduct

Plans and Statements of Mentor and Co-Mentors

Institutional Commitment to Candidate's Research Career

Human Subjects

Vertebrate Animals

Authentication of Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources

Biosketch (5 pages max)

OMB No. 0925-0001 and 0925-0002 (Rev. 09/17 Approved Through 03/31/2020)

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Provide the following information for the Seniority personnel and other significant contributors.
Follow this format for each person. **DO NOT EXCEED FIVE PAGES.**

NAME: Hunt, Morgan Casey

eRA COMMONS USER NAME (credential, e.g., agency login): huntmc

POSITION TITLE: Associate Professor of Psychology

EDUCATION/TRAINING (Begin with baccalaureate or other initial professional education, such as nursing, include postdoctoral training and residency training if applicable. Add/delete rows as necessary.)

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION	DEGREE (if applicable)	Completion Date MM/YYYY	FIELD OF STUDY
University of California, Berkeley	B.S.	05/1990	Psychology
University of Vermont	Ph.D.	05/1996	Experimental Psychology
University of California, Berkeley	Postdoctoral	08/1998	Public Health and Epidemiology

A. Personal Statement

I have the expertise, leadership, training, expertise and motivation necessary to successfully carry out the proposed research project. I have a broad background in psychology, with specific training and expertise in ethnographic and survey research and secondary data analysis on psychological aspects of drug addiction. My research includes neuropsychological changes associated with addiction. As PI or co-investigator on several university- and NIH-funded grants, I laid the groundwork for the proposed research by developing effective measures of disability, depression, and other psychosocial factors relevant to the aging substance abuser, and by establishing strong ties with community providers that will make it possible to recruit and track participants over time as documented in the following publications. In addition, I successfully administered the projects (e.g. staffing, research protections, budget), collaborated with other researchers, and produced several peer-reviewed publications from each project. As a result of these previous experiences, I am aware of the importance of frequent communication among project members and of constructing a realistic research plan, timeline, and budget. The current application builds logically on my prior work. During 2005-2006 my career was disrupted due to family obligations. However, upon returning to the field I immediately resumed my research projects and collaborations and successfully competed for NIH support.

- Merryly, R.J. & Hunt, M.C. (2004). Independent living, physical disability and substance abuse among the elderly. *Psychology and Aging*, 23(4), 10-22.
- Hunt, M.C., Jensen, J.L. & Crenshaw, W. (2007). Substance abuse and mental health among community-dwelling elderly. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 24(9), 1124-1135.
- Hunt, M.C., Wiechelt, S.A. & Merryly, R. (2008). Predicting the substance-abuse treatment needs of an aging population. *American Journal of Public Health*, 45(2), 236-245. PMID: PMC9162292 Hunt, M.C., Newlin, D.B. & Fishbein, D. (2009). Brain imaging in methamphetamine abusers across the life-span. *Gerontology*, 46(3), 122-145.

B. Positions and Honors

Positions and Employment

1998-2000 Fellow, Division of Intramural Research, National Institute of Drug Abuse, Bethesda, MD
 2000-2002 Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Middlebury College, Middlebury, VT
 2001- Consultant, Coastal Psychological Services, San Francisco, CA
 2002-2005 Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Washington University, St. Louis, MO
 2007- Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Washington University, St. Louis, MO

Other Experience and Professional Memberships

1995- Member, American Psychological Association
 1998- Member, Gerontological Society of America
 1998- Member, American Geriatrics Society
 2000- Associate Editor, *Psychology and Aging*
 2003- Board of Advisors, Senior Services of Eastern Missouri
 2003-05 NIH Peer Review Committee: Psychobiology of Aging, ad hoc reviewer
 2007-11 NIH Risk, Adult Addictions Study Section, members

Honors

2003 Outstanding Young Faculty Award, Washington University, St. Louis, MO
 2004 Excellence in Teaching, Washington University, St. Louis, MO
 2009 Award for Best in Interdisciplinary Ethnography, International Ethnographic Society

C. Contribution to Science

- My early publications directly addressed the fact that substance abuse is often overlooked in older adults. However, because many older adults were raised during an era of increased drug and alcohol use, there are reasons to believe that this will become an increasing issue as the population ages. These publications found that older adults appear in a variety of primary care settings or seek mental health providers to deal with emerging addiction problems. These publications document this emerging problem but guide primary care providers and geriatric mental health providers to recognize symptoms, assess the nature of the problem and apply the necessary interventions. By providing evidence and simple clinical approaches, this body of work has changed the standards of care for addicted older adults and will continue to provide assistance in relevant medical settings well into the future. I served as the primary investigator or co-investigator in all of these studies.
 - Gryczynski, J., Shaft, B.M., Merryly, R., & Hunt, M.C. (2002). Community based participatory research with late-life addicts. *American Journal of Alcohol and Drug Abuse*, 15(3), 222-238.
 - Shaft, B.M., Hunt, M.C., Merryly, R., & Venturi, R. (2003). Policy implications of genetic transmission of alcohol and drug abuse in female nonusers. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 30(5), 46-58.
 - Hunt, M.C., Marks, A.E., Shaft, B.M., Merryly, R., & Jensen, J.L. (2004). Early-life family and community characteristics and late-life substance abuse. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 28(2), 26-37.
 - Hunt, M.C., Marks, A.E., Venturi, R., Crenshaw, W. & Ratonian, A. (2007). Community-based intervention strategies for reducing alcohol and drug abuse in the elderly. *Addiction*, 104(9), 1436-1606. PMID: PMC9000292
- In addition to the contributions described above, with a team of collaborators, I directly documented the effectiveness of various intervention models for older substance abusers and demonstrated the importance of social support networks. These studies emphasized contextual factors in the etiology and maintenance of addictive disorders and the disruptive potential of networks in substance abuse treatment. This body of work also discusses the prevalence of alcohol, amphetamine, and opioid abuse in older adults and how networking approaches can be used to mitigate the effects of these disorders.
 - Hunt, M.C., Merryly, R. & Jensen, J.L. (2005). The effect of social support networks on morbidity among elderly substance abusers. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 57(4), 15-23.
 - Hunt, M.C., Pour, B., Marks, A.E., Merryly, R. & Jensen, J.L. (2005). Aging out of methadone treatment. *American Journal of Alcohol and Drug Abuse*, 15(6), 134-149.

c. Merryly, R. & Hunt, M.C. (2007). Randomized clinical trial of cotinine in older nicotine addicts. *Age and Ageing*, 38(2), 9-23. PMID: PMC9002364

3. Methadone maintenance has been used to treat narcotics addicts for many years but I led research that has shown that over the long-term, those in methadone treatment view themselves negatively and they gradually begin to view treatment as an intrusion into normal life. Elderly narcotics users were shown in carefully constructed ethnographic studies to be especially responsive to tailored social support networks that allow them to eventually reduce their maintenance doses and move into other forms of therapy. These studies also demonstrate the policy and commercial implications associated with these findings.

- Hunt, M.C. & Jensen, J.L. (2003). Morbidity among elderly substance abusers. *Journal of the Geriatrics*, 60(4), 45-61.
- Hunt, M.C. & Pour, B. (2004). Methadone treatment and personal assessment. *Journal Drug Abuse*, 45(5), 15-26.
- Merryly, R. & Hunt, M.C. (2005). The use of various nicotine delivery systems by older nicotine addicts. *Journal of Ageing*, 54(1), 24-41. PMID: PMC9112304
- Hunt, M.C., Jensen, J.L. & Merryly, R. (2008). The aging addict: ethnographic profiles of the elderly drug user. NY, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Complete List of Published Work in MyBibliography:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sites/myncbi/collections/public/1PgT7IEFIAJBTGMRDdWfmjWAO?sort=ate&direction=ascending>

D. Additional Information: Research Support and/or Scholastic Performance

Ongoing Research Support

R01 DA942367 Hunt (PI) 09/01/06-06/31/16
 Health trajectories and behavioral interventions among older substance abusers
 The goal of this study is to compare the effects of two substance abuse interventions on health outcomes in an urban population of older opiate addicts.
 Role: PI

R01 MH922731 Merryly (PI) 12/15/07-11/30/15
 Physical disability, depression and substance abuse in the elderly
 The goal of this study is to identify disability and depression trajectories and demographic factors associated with substance abuse in an independently-living elderly population.
 Role: Co-Investigator

Faculty Resources Grant, Washington University 08/15/09-08/14/15
 Opiate Addiction Database
 The goal of this project is to create an integrated database of demographic, social and biomedical information for homeless opiate abusers in two urban Missouri locations, using a number of state and local data sources.
 Role: PI

Completed Research Support

R21 AA998075 Hunt (PI) 01/01/11-12/31/13
 Community-based intervention for alcohol abuse
 The goal of this project was to assess a community-based strategy for reducing alcohol abuse among older individuals.
 Role: PI

Personal Statement: Your opportunity to explain your career and scientific history and to highlight important research and career achievements

Candidate Information and Career Development Goals

Candidate's Background:

Describe your past scientific history, indicating how the award fits into past and future research career development.

If there are consistent themes or issues that have guided previous work, these should be made clear. Alternatively, if your work has changed direction, indicate the reasons for the change.

Career Goals and Objectives:

Describe your short-term and long-term career development goals.

Justify the need for the award by describing how the career development award will enable you to develop and/or expand your research career.

Candidate's Plan for Career Development/Training Activities During Award Period:

Describe the new or enhanced research skills and knowledge you will acquire as a result of the proposed award.

For mentored career development awards, describe any structured activities that are part of the developmental plan, such as coursework or workshops that will help you learn new techniques or develop needed professional skills.

Briefly discuss each of the activities, other than research, in which you expect to participate.

For each activity, other than research, explain how it relates to the proposed research and to the career development plan. Indicate the percentage of time to be dedicated to each activity by year, expressed in person months.

Specific Aims (1 page)

State concisely the goals of the proposed research and summarize the expected outcome(s), including the impact that the results of the proposed research will have on the research field(s) involved.

List succinctly the specific objectives of the research proposed (e.g., to test a stated hypothesis, create a novel design, solve a specific problem, challenge an existing paradigm or clinical practice, address a critical barrier to progress in the field, or develop new technology).

Research Strategy

1. Significance

Explain the importance of the problem or critical barrier to progress that the proposed project addresses.

Describe the scientific premise for the proposed project, including consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of published research or preliminary data crucial to the support of your application.

Explain how the proposed project will improve scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice in one or more broad fields.

Describe how the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field will be changed if the proposed aims are achieved.

2. Innovation

Explain how the application challenges current research or clinical practice paradigms.

Describe any novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions to be developed or used, and any advantage over existing methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions.

3. Approach

Describe the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses to be used to accomplish the specific aims of the project. Describe the experimental design and methods proposed and how they will achieve robust and unbiased results. Include how the data will be collected, analyzed, and interpreted, as well as any resource sharing plans as appropriate.

Discuss potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success anticipated to achieve the aims.

Explain how relevant biological variables, such as sex, are factored into research designs and analyses for studies in vertebrate animals and humans. For example, strong justification from the scientific literature, preliminary data, or other relevant considerations, must be provided for applications proposing to study only one sex.

Plans and Statements of Mentor and Co-Mentors

The mentor and co-mentor(s) (if applicable) must each document their role and willingness to participate in the project, and explain how they will contribute to the development of the candidate's research career. Each statement should include all of the following:

1. The plan for the candidate's training and research career development. Include information not only about research, but also about other developmental activities, such as seminars, scientific meetings, training in RCR, and presentations. Discuss expectations for publications over the entire period of the proposed project. Define what aspects of the proposed research project the candidate will be allowed to continue to pursue as part of his/her independent research program.
2. The source of anticipated support for the candidate's research project for each year of the award period.
3. The nature and extent of supervision and mentoring of the candidate, and commitment to the candidate's development that will occur during the award period.
4. The candidate's anticipated teaching load for the award period (number and types of courses or seminars), clinical responsibilities, committee and administrative assignments, and the portion of time available for research.
5. A plan for transitioning the candidate from the mentored stage of his/her career to the independent investigator stage by the end of the project period of the award. Describe the mentor's (or co-mentor's) previous experience as a mentor, including type of mentoring (e.g., graduate students, career development awardees, postdoctoral fellows), number of persons mentored, and career outcomes.

Institutional Commitment to Candidate's Research Career

The sponsoring institution must provide a document on institutional letterhead that describes its commitment to the candidate and the candidate's career development, independent of the receipt of the CDA. It is also essential to document the institution's commitment to the retention, development, and advancement of the candidate during the period of the award.

The "Institutional Commitment to Candidate's Research Career Development" attachment should generally document the institution's agreement to provide adequate time, support, equipment, facilities, and resources to the candidate for research and career development activities. See the list below for specific items to include in the document.

1. Agree to release the candidate from other duties and activities so that the candidate can devote the required percentage of time for development of a research career, as specified by the FOA. For most K awards, commitment of at least 75 percent or nine person months of time is required.
2. Describe actions that will be taken to ensure that the candidate can devote the required time to research career development (e.g., reduction of the candidate's teaching load, committee and administrative assignments, and clinical or other professional activities for the current academic year). If the candidate's clinical or teaching responsibilities will be reduced, describe how this will be accommodated (e.g., hiring additional staff, reassigning staff, etc.).
3. Describe the candidate's academic appointment, bearing in mind that the appointment must be full-time, and that the appointment and the continuation of salary should not be contingent upon the receipt of this award.
4. Describe the proportion of time currently available for the candidate's research and what the candidate's institutional responsibilities will be if an award is made.
5. Describe how the institution will provide the candidate with appropriate office and laboratory space, equipment, and other resources to carry out the proposed Research Plan.
6. Describe how the institution will be supportive of any proposed mentor(s), other staff, and/or collaborations with other faculty consistent with the career development plan.

K Award Scoring Criteria

K01 and K08

Candidate <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Does the candidate have the potential to develop as an independent and productive researcher?</i>• <i>Are the candidate's prior training and research experience appropriate for this award?</i>• <i>Is the candidate's academic, clinical (if relevant), and research record of high quality?</i>• <i>Is there evidence of the candidate's commitment to meeting the program objectives to become an independent investigator in research?</i>• <i>Do the letters of reference address the above review criteria, and do they provide evidence that the candidate has a high potential for becoming an independent investigator?</i>
Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none">•
Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none">•

K99

Candidate <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Based on the candidate's prior research and training experience, track record, referee's evaluations, and the quality and originality of prior research and the current application, what is the candidate's potential to become a highly successful, independent investigator who will contribute significantly to his/her chosen field of biomedical, behavioral, or clinical related research?</i>• <i>Considering the years of postdoctoral research experience to date, what is the candidate's record of research productivity, including the quality of peer-reviewed scientific publications?</i>• <i>What is the quality of the candidate's pre- and postdoctoral research training, with respect to development of appropriate scientific and technical expertise?</i>• <i>Given the candidate's prior training, proposed career development plan, and the referees' evaluations, is it reasonable to expect that the candidate will be able to achieve an independent, tenure-track or equivalent faculty position within the time period requested for the K99 phase of this award?</i>
Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none">•
Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none">•

K Award Scoring Criteria

K01 and K08

Career Development Plan/Career Goals & Objectives

- *What is the likelihood that the plan will contribute substantially to the scientific development of the candidate and lead to scientific independence?*
- *Are the candidate's prior training and research experience appropriate for this award?*
- *Are the content, scope, phasing, and duration of the career development plan appropriate when considered in the context of prior training/research experience and the stated training and research objectives for achieving research independence?*
- *Are there adequate plans for monitoring and evaluating the candidate's research and career development progress?*
- *If proposed, will the clinical trial experience contribute to the applicant's research career development?*

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

K99

Career Development Plan/Career Goals & Objectives

- *Are the content and duration of the proposed components of the career development plan appropriate and well-justified for the candidate's current stage of scientific and professional development and proposed research career goals?*
- *To what extent does the proposed career development plan enhance or augment the applicant's research training and skills acquisition to date?*
- *Is the proposed career development plan likely to contribute substantially to the scientific and professional development of the candidate, and facilitate his/her successful transition to independence?*
- *To what extent are the plans for evaluating the K99 awardee's progress adequate and appropriate for guiding the applicant towards a successful transition to the independent phase of the award?*
- *Is the timeline planned for transition to the independent phase of the award appropriate for the candidate's current stage of scientific and professional development, anticipated productivity, and the career development proposed for the K99 phase of the award?*

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

K Award Scoring Criteria

K01 and K08

Research Plan

- *Are the proposed research questions, design, and methodology of significant scientific and technical merit?*
- *Is there a strong scientific premise for the project?*
- *Has the candidate presented strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach, as appropriate for the work proposed?*
- *Has the candidate presented adequate plans to address relevant biological variables, such as sex, for studies in vertebrate animals or human subjects?*
- *Is the research plan relevant to the candidate's research career objectives?*
- *Is the research plan appropriate to the candidate's stage of research development and as a vehicle for developing the research skills described in the career development plan?*
- *Will the proposed research lead to an independent line of research for the candidate?*

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

K99

Research Plan

- *Is the proposed K99 phase research significant and scientifically sound?*
- *Is there a strong scientific premise for the project?*
- *Has the candidate presented strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach, as appropriate for the work proposed?*
- *Has the candidate presented adequate plans to address relevant biological variables, such as sex, for studies in vertebrate animals or human subjects?*
- *Are the scientific and technical merits of the K99 research appropriate for developing the research skills described in the career development plan, and appropriate for developing a highly successful R00 research program?*
- *Is the proposed R00 phase research significant, scientifically sound, and a logical extension of the K99 phase research? Is there evidence of long-term viability of the proposed R00 phase research plan?*
- *Does the R00 phase project address an innovative hypothesis or challenge existing paradigms? Does the project develop or employ novel concepts, approaches, methodologies, tools, or technologies?*
- *To what extent is the proposed R00 phase research likely to foster the career of the candidate as a successful, independent investigator in biomedical, behavioral, or clinical research?*

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

K Award Scoring Criteria

K01 and K08

Mentor(s), Co-Mentor(s), Consultant(s), Collaborator(s)

- *Are the qualifications of the mentor(s) in the area of the proposed research appropriate?*
- *Does the mentor(s) adequately address the candidate's potential and his/her strengths and areas needing improvement?*
- *Is there adequate description of the quality and extent of the mentor's proposed role in providing guidance and advice to the candidate?*
- *Is the mentor's description of the elements of the research career development activities, including formal course work adequate?*
- *Is there evidence of the mentor's, consultant's, and/or collaborator's previous experience in fostering the development of independent investigators?*
- *Is there evidence of the mentor's current research productivity and peer-reviewed support?*
- *Is active/pending support for the proposed research project appropriate and adequate?*
- *Are there adequate plans for monitoring and evaluating the career development awardee's progress toward independence?*

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

K99

Mentor(s), Co-Mentor(s), Consultant(s), Collaborator(s)

- *To what extent does the mentor(s) have a strong track record in training future independent researchers?*
- *To what extent are the mentor's research qualifications and experience, scientific stature, and mentoring track record appropriate for the applicant's career development needs?*
- *Is the supervision proposed for the mentored phase of support adequate, and is the commitment of the mentor(s) to the applicant's career development appropriate and sufficient?*
- *Does the mentor provide an appropriate plan that addresses the candidate's training needs, and that is likely to foster the candidate's continued development and transition to independence?*
- *Does the mentor describe an acceptable plan for clear separation of the candidate's research and research career from the mentor's research, including identifying the components of the research plan that the K99 candidate may take to an independent research position?*
- *Are the consultants'/collaborators' research and/or mentoring qualifications appropriate for their roles in the proposed K99 phase of the award? Do they provide letters of support that affirm their commitment? If applicable, are the Advisory Committee members' qualifications appropriate for their roles in the proposed K99 phase of the award? Do they provide letters of support that affirm their commitment?*

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

K Award Scoring Criteria

K01 and K08

Environment and Institutional Commitment to the Candidate

- *Is there clear commitment of the sponsoring institution to ensure that a required minimum of the candidate's effort (9 person-months 75% of the candidate's full-time professional effort for K01 and K25, 50% minimum effort for orthopaedic surgeon K08 and K23) will be devoted directly to the research and career development activities described in the application, with the remaining percent effort being devoted to an appropriate balance of research, teaching, administrative, and clinical responsibilities?*
- *Is the institutional commitment to the career development of the candidate appropriately strong?*
- *Are the research facilities, resources and training opportunities, including faculty capable of productive collaboration with the candidate adequate and appropriate?*
- *Is the environment for scientific and professional development of the candidate of high quality?*
- *Is there assurance that the institution intends the candidate to be an integral part of its research program as an independent investigator?*

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

K99

1. Environment and Institutional Commitment to the Candidate

- *To what extent does the institution provide a high quality environment appropriate for the candidate's development during the K99 phase of the award?*
- *To what extent are the research facilities and educational opportunities, including collaborating faculty, adequate and appropriate for the candidate's research and career development goals during the K99 phase of the award? Is adequate evidence provided that the K99 sponsoring institution is strongly committed to fostering the candidate's development and preparation for transition to independence?*
- *Is there adequate assurance that the required minimum of 9 person-months (75% of the candidate's full-time professional effort) will be devoted directly to the research training, career development, and research activities proposed for the K99 phase of the award?*

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

K Award Scoring

FELLOWSHIPS & CAREER AWARDS

Overall Impact:

The likelihood that the proposed training (F) or career development (K) will enhance the candidate's potential for a productive, independent scientific research career in a health-related field.

Overall Impact	High	Medium	Low
Score	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

Evaluating Overall Impact Consider the 5 criteria (weighting based on reviewer's judgment):		<i>e.g. Proposes training or career development of high value/benefit for the candidate who has high potential for developing into a productive, independent scientist. May have some or no weaknesses in the criteria.</i>	<i>e.g. Proposes training or career development of high or moderate value/benefit for the candidate who has high or moderate potential for further development, but weaknesses in the criteria reduce the overall impact to medium.</i>	<i>e.g. Proposes training or career development of moderate or low value/benefit for the candidate who has moderate or low potential for further development. Weaknesses in the criteria reduce the overall impact to low.</i>
Fs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant • Sponsor(s) • Research Training Plan • Training Potential • Institutional Environment & Commitment 	Ks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate • Career Development Plan/Goals* • Research Plan • Mentor(s)** • Environment & Institutional Commitment 	<i>e.g. Proposes training or career development of moderate value/benefit for the candidate who shows moderate potential. May have some weaknesses in the criteria.</i>		<i>e.g. Proposes training or career development of low value/benefit for the candidate who shows low potential. May have some weaknesses in the criteria.</i>
and other score influences, e.g. human subjects, animal welfare, inclusion plans, and biohazards				
*K05 and K24: Plan to Provide Mentoring **K02: Consultants/Collaborators		5 is a good, medium-impact application. The entire scale (1-9) should always be considered.		

General Advice for Preparing a K Award

- 1. Start working on your grant early!** Realistically a grant will take you 2 months of uninterrupted time to write. If you plan to also work in the lab, give yourself an additional 1-2 months.
- 2. Talk to your mentor early and often.** Give them clear deadlines for their letters. Get previous examples of training plans, Facilities, Equipment, Budget Justification Sections.
- 3. Get help.** Look at other successful K grants. Ask for help from your mentor and other colleagues who have successfully written K grants.
- 4. Plan on writing and re-writing every section.** Specific Aims will be the first and last section you write.
- 5. Work on hardest sections (e.g. Specific Aims, Research Plan, Career Plan) when you are most productive (e.g. morning).** Work on other sections (e.g. Equipment) at times of day when you are less productive. There is always some part of the grant you can be working on. Do NOT wait to do “busy-work” sections until the end.
- 6. Plan on finishing your grant 2 weeks before deadline so you can get people to review your grant.** Pick people who are constructively critical. A reviewer who says “looks great” is not helpful.
- 7. Plan on re-submitting your grant.** It is highly likely you will need to submit your grant more than once. Deadlines are Feb 12, June 16, and Oct 16. If you need to re-submit, you will have to skip a cycle. Keep in mind that you must submit K99 before you have been a postdoc 4 years.