Q1: Am I correct in thinking that an application must be jointly submitted by a CBO and academic partnering institution?

A1. The RFA requires that the not-for-profit 501(c)(3) CBO in New York State be the applicant organization (see page 3) and that the CBO enlist the cooperative partnership of two collaborators - a content consultant and an assessment consultant - faculty members employed by appropriate academic institutions (see page 3). These consultants would essentially become "subcontractors" of the non-profit CBO. Letters are required from these collaborating consultants (see page 3), and the proposed budget should reflect the cost of the consultant services (see page 16).

Q2: Are New York State tribal nations eligible to apply for these funds (e.g., the Health Department of the Seneca Nation)?

A2: No. The RFA language requires non-profit status. However, the Department recognizes that the health departments of tribal nations provide a valuable community-based service and could be viable candidates for this funding. As such, the Department will seek to clarify this and expand eligible applicants in future RFAs for this program.

Q3: Can Wadsworth scientists apply?

A3: Per the excerpt from the RFA (below) Wadsworth Center cannot be the lead organization for this particular RFA.

- Eligibility

The applicant must be a not-for-profit 501(c)(3) CBO in New York State serving one or more New York communities, including those participating in the DOH Healthy Women Partnerships. A CBO offers several services to a community and its governance staff and volunteers are drawn from that community. CBOs providing breast cancer programs often involve breast cancer survivors.

However, a Wadsworth scientist may be appropriate to serve as a consultant to the applicant CBO - either:

an appropriate faculty member (e.g., an oncologist or research scientist) employed by or on the faculty of one of New York State’s medical centers, (including the 12 accredited allopathic medical schools and affiliated teaching
hospitals, listed in Attachment 1), research institutes, or an appropriate
department of a college or university who is both qualified and prepared to act as
a breast cancer Content Consultant to the project. The Content Consultant will
ensure that the information presented is medically and scientifically accurate.

OR

a faculty member employed by an accredited four-year college or university
social science or educational research department or school of public health who
is qualified and prepared to act as an Assessment Consultant to the project. The
Assessment Consultant will ensure a scientifically sound and objective evaluation
of the degree to which the goals of the funded program were achieved. The
purpose of the evaluation is to ensure a sound basis is provided for other
communities to adopt these new approaches.

Q4: If so, may we use material that is also part of a pending grant application?

A4: Pending grant applications are considered for "overlap" in a manner
similar to the NIH process (also see Q&A #16).

Applicants should attach the following, if applicable, to the application:

- **Current Support**: A list of all current, active grant awards. Include the
  name of the granting agency, the grant number, the title of the project, the
  amount and time period of the award.

- **Pending Support**: List all applications submitted to granting agencies
  and currently being reviewed. Include the name of the granting agency,
  the title of the application, the amount requested, and the projected time
  period of the award.

- **Planned Support**: List any applications that you plan to submit to
  granting agencies during the next 12 months.

Q5: How strict are the time constraints for the four Project Phases identified in
Section III.A. Application Elements?

A5: The duration of the entire project is 24 months. The Planning, Trial
Implementation, Assessment, and Revision Phases were divided into
roughly equal phases of six months each. This is a guideline and actual
time for each phase may vary by project.

Q6. Regarding collaboration – Is it permissible for two CBO's to submit a joint
application?

A6. It was not the intent to exclude joint applications. The RFA has been
modified to reflect this and to permit receipt of facilities and administration
costs for each collaborating CBO. One of the CBOs must function as the lead organization to which payment will be made in the event of an award.

Q7. If a CBO wishes to collaborate but does not have paid staff to devote to this project, can staff be hired specifically for this project and would they be paid through the Facilities and Administration Cost line?

A7. Staff can be hired specifically for this project. The project can pay for appropriate staff salaries as direct costs (listed as personal services). It is not appropriate to pay for direct costs through the Facilities and Administration Cost line, which covers overhead (indirect costs). To receive F&A costs in any amount, applicants must request and justify these costs.

Q8. Can you differentiate between the term ‘target audience’ as used on page 3 and on page 6?

A8. The target audience members are the intended recipients of the educational materials developed through the program. Page 3 of the RFA lists examples of target audiences and is not an exhaustive list. Persons diagnosed with breast cancer and members of their support networks are not excluded from possible target audiences. In addition, effective educational materials resulting from an award will be disseminated by the Department to the breast cancer community at large as “best practice” models suggested for replication.

Q9. Discuss pre- and post-presentation instruments (page 6) and by whom are they designed?

A9. These instruments are designed by the Assessment Consultant to measure gains in participant knowledge of those attending/receiving the breast cancer education sessions/materials.

Q10. Describe the IRB process regarding Human Subjects.

A10. IRB approval will be required as human subjects will be involved in activities during the proposed project period, however, IRB approval is required for funded applications and is required prior to contract execution. For the application process, “Pending” may be entered in Item 12b of the Face Page (Attachment 3). Most applicant CBOs will not have an IRB - the IRB of the Assessment Consultant should be used.

Q11. Explain the modifications made to the RFA review process.

A11. The modification to the review process became necessary when the contract process to hire an outside agency to coordinate the peer review
process was terminated in March. In light of the short time frame remaining to establish the peer review panel, and the need to maintain an effective, impartial, and high-quality review panel at a reasonable cost, the Department has waived its plan to use only out-of-state reviewers. Additionally, the Department will allow ex officio chairs to be other than HRSB members. Although some application reviewers and/or chairs may come from New York State, all members will still be required to sign confidentiality statements and conflict of interest statements, and will not participate in discussions and votes on any application for which they have a financial, friendship, family or work relationship or other conflict of interest.

Q12. If six applications are evaluated and forwarded to the HRSB for approval, and the HRSB does not approve all six, would other applications be considered at that time?

A12. No. Assuming more than six applications are received, only the six highest scoring applications will be considered by the HRSB for funding (see page 18 of the RFA). Based on the evaluation and review criteria it is possible that fewer than six applications will be recommended by the HRSB for funding.

Q13. Will there be a debriefing to assist applicants not receiving an award to improve future applications?

A13. Applicants may request a debriefing. On page 19, Section D. Review and Award Process, it states “Following the award of grants from this RFA, applicants may request a debriefing from the NYS DOH Wadsworth Center no later than six months from the date of the award announcement. This debriefing will be limited to the positive and negative aspects of the subject application.”

Q14. Describe “socio-cultural, behavioral and psychological issues relevant to breast cancer” (page 5, II.D Examples of eligible topics).

A14. Issues that might be relevant to address in educational materials include social stigmas associated with breast cancer in some communities, impact of treatments on energy levels and cognitive functions, or issues of self-esteem. Keep in mind that Section II.D. and indeed, this clarification, provides examples of eligible topics and are not exhaustive lists.

Q15. Is there an advantage to incorporating more than one eligible topic into an application?

A15. There is no advantage or disadvantage to those including more than one eligible topic into the proposal. Consideration will be given to the quality of
the plan. Applicants should consider whether to address one eligible topic with a good plan or to address multiple topics that may weaken the plan. Keep in mind that Section II.D. provides examples of eligible topics and is not an exhaustive list.

Q16. Define “overlapping funding” (also see Q&A #4).

A16. Overlapping funding may be defined as ‘double-dipping’ or being paid for the same work from different sources. As always, no overlaps with Other Support are permitted with project funds (see page 9, IV.F. Term of Contract).