

FPTA Linda Crane Research Grant Guidelines

Revised 04/2023

Amount of Grant

FPTA will consider grant applications up to \$25,000.

Grant Period and Payments

The funding period for each grant is two (2) years, with grant awards issued in odd years. Grant awards will be made to the recipient's organization and not to the applicant directly.

Eligibility

The Principal Investigator must be a member in good standing in the FPTA and have been a member in good standing of the APTA for the past 2 years. Principal Investigators who have previously been awarded the Linda Crane Research Grant as a Principal Investigator are only eligible to apply after a 5-year moratorium has passed. Past award recipients are encouraged to mentor colleagues and may participate in studies as Co-investigators.

Eligible organizations:

Any employer of physical therapists or physical therapist assistants, with the exception of sole proprietorships or single provider limited liability corporations.

The applicant should identify the organizational designee to whom funds will be released. Funds will not be released to individual members. Consideration will be given to applications that have received matching funds. To verify a match, a letter of confirmation of matching grant support is required to be submitted electronically with application.

Areas of Study

Submissions are encouraged from a broad range of topics related to physical therapy practice, education, and service delivery. All submissions must be research as defined by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [§ 46.102(d)] and should directly relate to the physical therapy profession. Consideration will be given to projects with the intention and potential to obtain future funding to advance the line of inquiry.

Submission Deadline

July 1st

Notice of Award

Grant recipients and organization designees will be notified of acceptance or rejection of grants and reporting deadlines for accepted applications in early August.

Recipient's Obligation:

The recipient of this award:

1. Present the findings of this study at the FPTA Annual Conference and Assembly of Representatives within 3 years of receiving the award.
2. Provide a progress report to the FPTA Research Committee by the 1-year anniversary date of the grant and a final report upon completion. If the study extends beyond 2 years, then a progress report should be submitted by the anniversary date of the grant each year.
3. The FPTA should be acknowledged as the funding source on any publications, presentations, and other dissemination products associated with the research. Please acknowledge the funding source as follows: Funding provided (or provided in part) by the Florida Physical Therapy Association Linda Crane Research Grant
4. The Recipient is also asked to be present for the announcement of the award at the FPTA Annual Conference and Assembly of Representatives.

Publicity

FPTA reserves the right to publicize its grant awards, recipient names, organizations, and research titles.

Copies or descriptions of all materials (publications, conference presentations or patents filed) arising from FPTA grants should be supplied to FPTA upon request.

Grant Administration

The responsibility for the financial administration of grants is delegated to the appropriate organization, department, or unit.

Expenditures

Grants must be used to fund only direct program costs. They cannot be used to fund overhead, tuition, indirect or investment management fees.

Budget Categories

Emphasis should be given to items that specifically support project goals (as opposed to general items such as furniture, office supplies, personal computers, etc.).

Salary

Investigators salary plus fringe are eligible expenses associated with this grant. Justification for each funded investigator's percent effort must be clearly described within the budget justification.

Travel

Travel related to the following reasons are eligible expenses for this grant:

- 1) Attendance to the FPTA Annual Conference for one (1) investigator to present the study findings

- 2) Attendance to one (1) additional scientific meeting (e.g., CSM) for one (1) investigator to present study findings.
- 3) Travel associated with research activities such as data collection (e.g., to/from clinical sites). FPTA follows federal mileage rates (\$0.65.5/mile as of 2023)

Equipment

Equipment provided through FPTA funding, although designated for primary use by the grantee, must be made available to faculty, students, and others throughout the recipient's organization. All equipment purchased through grants becomes the property of the recipient's organization.

Adherence to Budget

Expenditures of grant funds during the grant period must adhere to the specific categories and items in the approved grant budget. See requirement for budget changes below.

Process for Grant Changes

1) Budget Changes

Funds may not be re-budgeted without the written approval of the FPTA research committee. Requests must have the prior approval of the appropriate organization official. The request and organization approval of the request must then be forwarded to FPTA for final consideration.

2) Grant Period

- 1) **Effective Date:** The start date of the grant will be set forth in the letter of agreement. No changes in start date will be considered.
- 2) **Expiration Date.** The grant period is two (2) years. If additional time is required, a request for an extension must be submitted to FPTA at least 30 days prior to the expiration date. Extension requests must be submitted electronically and must include:
 - A narrative that includes a progress report and the reason for the delay.
 - An official interim financial report indicating funds spent to date and funds remaining.

The number of grant extensions that can be requested is limited to one (1), 12-month extension.

3) Senior Personnel or Scope of Project Changes

Changes in principal or co-principal investigators identified in the original grant request or changes to the scope of the project may not be made without the approval of the FPTA Research Committee. Forward a written approval from the organization official or similarly designated individual along with an explanation for the requested change to FPTA for consideration.

Receipt of Additional Funding from Other Sources

The principal investigator or author will notify FPTA when funding that provides support for the project or for any budget item funded by the FPTA grant is received from another source during the grant period. This additional funding will not affect FPTA's commitment to the project.

Repayment of Unused Funds

Any portion of grant funds unexpended and not committed at the completion of the project or at the end of the grant period, including any authorized extension thereof, must be returned to FPTA within 30 days of receipt of the final financial report.

Funding Closeout

Following completion of the project, final reports will be due to FPTA by the date specified in the notification letter or the extension approval notification.

Final reports to be submitted:

Final Narrative Report

The final narrative report should include the following:

- A summary of the study aims and methods used
- A description of the collected data (e.g., number of full vs partial data sets, variables collected, nature of the data collected)
- A summary of the primary and secondary findings along with conclusions drawn
- A summary of dissemination products already completed (e.g., publications and presentations)
- A description of further plans with data collected including publications, presentations, secondary analyses, grant submissions, etc.

Final Financial Report

This report must be submitted with the signature of the organization or academic institution's financial controller or his/her designee. It is understood that grant reports are made available to the FPTA staff. All other interested persons requesting such reports will need permission from the grantee and FPTA.

It is the responsibility of the PI to see that final narrative and financial reports are submitted on or before the due date specified in the notification letter or in the extension approval.

If final narrative and financial reports are not received within 30 days of the due date future fund disbursement will be suspended.

GRANT REVIEW PROCEDURES

Composition of scientific peer review groups.

The chair of the research committee shall establish a review panel consisting of at least three members.

Panel members will be selected based upon their training and experience in relevant scientific or technical fields, or upon their qualifications as authorities knowledgeable in the various disciplines and fields related to rehabilitation research. The following should be considered:

- The level of formal scientific or technical education completed or experience acquired by the individual
- The extent to which the individual has engaged in relevant research
- The role (e.g., principal investigator, assistant) of the individual and the quality of the research

Timeline for grant reviews

- FPTA Staff to post announcement/call for submissions on FPTA web site by mid-April.
- Submission Deadline for Linda Crane Grant application, July 1.
- Chair, or designee, will determine if the grant is eligible for review
- Determine presence or absence of conflict of interest for review panel
- Panel receives Linda Crane Grant applications by July 7th.
- Return application reviews by July 21.
- Chair will assimilate the scores and comments
- Web based review discussion, Last week of July.
- Notification to FPTA Board of Directors of the Committee's selection for the award
- PI notified early August.

Conflict of interest for reviewers

A reviewer will be determined to be in conflict if any of the following situations is true:

- 1) Individuals Participating with Major Professional Roles. Individuals participating with major professional roles include:
 - a. the Principal Investigator
 - b. individuals listed as Senior/Key Personnel, Other Significant Contributors, collaborators, and consultants
- 2) Professional Relationships with investigators listed on the proposal
 - a. within the preceding three years, has collaborated with, co-authored a publication(s) with, and/or mentored or trained the PI or an individual named on the application as participating with a major professional role
 - b. is in collaboration, is negotiating collaboration, or is preparing an application(s) or publication(s) with the PI or with an individual named in the application as participating with a major professional role
 - c. writes a letter of general support or enthusiasm for the application in question but plays no substantive role in the proposed work
 - d. has a primary professional appointment in the same organizational component/school of a multi-component academic institution, hospital, health

center, or research institute as that of a named individual listed on the application or project as participating with a major professional role.

Scoring

Scoring will follow Foundation for Physical Therapy Research guidelines for reviewers

- 1) Grant application scoring system uses a 9-point scale for both overall impact scores and scores for individual review criteria.
- 2) For the overall impact score, the scale is used by all eligible (without conflict of interest) panel members
- 3) For criterion scores, the scale is only used by the assigned reviewers to evaluate individual criteria
 - a. Significance to the profession of Physical Therapy
 - b. Investigator(s) and environment
 - c. Approach
 - d. reviewers should consider the strengths and weaknesses within each criterion. For example, a major strength may outweigh many minor and correctable weaknesses.
- 4) The budget and the protection of human subjects sections will be reviewed and deemed satisfactory or unsatisfactory by the reviewers.

SCORING GUIDANCE

Numerical Score

1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
4	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weakness
5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
7	Fair	Some strengths but at least one major weakness
8	Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
9	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Minor weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen merit and/or the expected successful completion of the overall project

Moderate weakness: A weakness that lessens merit and/or the expected successful completion of the overall project

Major weakness: A weakness that severely limits merit and/or the expected successful completion of the overall project

Preliminary Scores

- 1) Before the review meeting, assigned reviewers determine preliminary scores for each of the scored review criteria and a preliminary score for the overall impact
 - a. The impact score should reflect the reviewer's overall evaluation, not a numerical average of individual criterion scores
- 2) Reviewers should consider the full range of the rating scale and the scoring descriptors in assigning preliminary and final scores
 - a. A reviewer should not assume that the applications assigned to him/her necessarily cover that entire range of scores, and should assign scores as appropriate for the work or science proposed
- 3) An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major impact
 - a. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field
- 4) The reviewers assigned to each application will prepare a written critique. Applications will be evaluated according to the review criteria listed

Final scores are given based on the outcome of the deliberations at the peer review meeting

Criterion Scoring

- 1) Criterion scores are provided for all applications by assigned reviewers
- 2) Criterion scores are intended to convey how each assigned reviewer weighed the strengths and weaknesses of each section
 - a. Providing scores without providing comments in the review critique is discouraged
 - b. If the reviewer's opinion changed as a result of discussion at the meeting, the reviewer should change his/her criterion scores to match his/her critiques and overall impact score
- 3) The criterion scores will be provided at the beginning of each critique in the summary statement returned to the principal investigator

Overall Impact Score

- 1) Discussed applications receive numerical impact scores from all eligible reviewers
- 2) The impact score for an application is based on each individual reviewer's assessment of the scored criteria plus additional criteria regarding the protection and inclusion of human subjects; vertebrate animal care and welfare; biohazards, and any criteria specific to the funding opportunity
- 3) Reviewers whose evaluations or opinions of an application fall outside the range of those presented by the assigned reviewers and discussant(s) should ensure that their opinions are brought to the attention of the entire committee
- 4) Reviewers should assign the score that they believe best represents the impact of the application, and not feel constrained to limit their scores to the upper half of the score range if they do not feel such a score is warranted
- 5) Reviewers will score an application as presented in its entirety

- 6) After the meeting, individual reviewer scores will be summed to determine the final impact score.

Reviewer Guidance

- 1) Overall impact, for a research project, is the project's likelihood to have a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved.
- 2) Each review criterion should be assessed based on the strength of that criterion in the context of the work being proposed
- 3) An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major impact, e.g., a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.
- 4) The reviewers assigned to each application will prepare a written critique. Applications will be evaluated according to the review criteria listed in the review form and guide. Please provide comments addressing the guidance questions for each criterion. A critique is most useful and influential if it:
 - a. Provides detailed analysis of strengths and/or weaknesses
 - b. Makes sense to someone who has not read the application and is not an expert in the field
 - c. Written in paragraphs (not a bulleted list)

Explanation of individual criteria

Significance to the profession of Physical Therapy

- 1) Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field?
- 2) Does the project address a Research Agenda question? If so, which question(s)? Does the proposed methodology enable the investigator to answer the Research Agenda question(s)?
- 3) If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical technologies, treatments, services, or preventative instructions that drive this field be changed?
- 4) Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions?
- 5) Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of practice or novel in the broad sense?
- 6) Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?

Investigator(s) and environment

- 1) Is/are the Primary Investigator, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project?
 - a. Do they have appropriate experience and training?

- b. The Primary Investigator should not have previously acquired a substantive extramural research award as an independent investigator
 - c. Is there evidence of clinical/academic collaboration?
- 2) Will the scientific or clinical environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success?
- 3) Are the institutional support, equipment, and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed?
- 4) Will the project benefit from unique features of the environment, participant populations, or collaborative arrangements?

Approach

- 1) Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analysis well reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project?
- 2) Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility and will particularly risky aspects be managed?
- 3) Protections for Human Subjects. When rating this criterion consider the following questions:
 - a. If the application designates that No Human Subjects are involved, does the research propose the use of human cells, specimens, or data from living individuals?
 - b. If the application designates one or more of the 6 human subjects exemptions, is the claim for exemption adequately justified?
 - c. If the application designates Yes for Human subjects without exemption, does the application adequately address the 4 points required in the human subjects section?
 - i. Does the application adequately describe Human Subjects Involvement, Characteristics, and Design, Sources of Materials, and Potential Risk?
 - ii. Does the application adequately describe Recruitment and Informed Consent and Protections Against Risk?
 - iii. Does the application adequately describe how potential risks to subjects appear reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits?
 - iv. If the proposed research includes a clinical trial, does the application describe an appropriate Data and Safety Monitoring Plan?

Budget

- 1) Are the budget and the requested period of support fully justified and reasonable in relation to the proposed research?
- 2) Are the costs allowable per the policies and procedures?