



GRANT POLICIES

***RUNX1* Research Program – American Cancer Society
Leukemia Exploration and Prevention (LEAP) Grant Program**

EFFECTIVE AUGUST 2024

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION DEADLINE: October 29, 2024

**AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY, INC.
Extramural Discovery Science Department**

**Web site: <http://www.cancer.org>
Email: grants@cancer.org**

Program Contact: paul.campbell@cancer.org

MISSION

The **American Cancer Society**'s mission is to improve the lives of people with cancer and their families through advocacy, research, and patient support, to ensure everyone has an opportunity to prevent, detect, treat, and survive cancer.

The ***RUNX1* Research Program**'s mission is to improve the quality of life and prevent blood cancer in individuals with *RUNX1* familial platelet disorder (*RUNX1*-FPD).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	DESCRIPTION OF THE LEUKEMIA EXPLORATION AND PREVENTION RFA.....	3
3.	AWARDS TO BE FUNDED UNDER THE RFA	4
4.	AUTHORITY FOR MAKING GRANTS	7
5.	SOURCE OF FUNDS	7
6.	WHO MAY APPLY	7
7.	TOBACCO-INDUSTRY FUNDING POLICY	8
8.	COLLABORATIONS WITH ACS INTRAMURAL SCIENTISTS (IF APPLICABLE)	8
9.	ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES	9
10.	PEER REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.....	10
11.	APPLICATION DEADLINES	11
12.	NOTIFICATION OF APPLICATION RECEIPT AND REVIEW.....	11
13.	GRANT MANAGEMENT AND PAYMENTS.....	11
14.	PROGRESS REPORTS AND REVIEW.....	11
15.	PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER GRANT-RELATED COMMUNICATIONS	12
16.	FINANCIAL RECORDS AND REPORTS	13
17.	EXPENDITURES.....	13
18.	OWNERSHIP OF EQUIPMENT.....	14
19.	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.....	14
20.	REQUEST FOR GRANT MODIFICATIONS	15
21.	CANCELLATION OF GRANT	16
	APPENDIX A: GUIDELINES FOR MAINTAINING RESEARCH AND PEER REVIEW INTEGRITY	17

Organizational Assurances: The Lead PI and his or her institution must ensure that organizational assurances and certifications from all team member institutions are obtained. The assurances and certifications are made and verified by the signature of the institutional official signing the application.

These may include:

IRB and/or IACUC Approvals. If applicable, these approvals are required with documentation provided within 3 months of grant activation.

Human Subjects or Vertebrate Animals. All activities involving either human or vertebrate animals as subjects must be approved by an appropriate institutional committee and documentation provided within 3 months of grant activation.

HHS Compliance. Compliance with current US Department of Health and Human Services research subjects' protection regulations.

ACS Guidelines. These include conflict of interest, recombinant DNA, and scientific misconduct and are required.

The institution of the Lead PI is responsible for the accuracy, validity, and conformity with the most current institutional guidelines for all administrative, fiscal, and scientific information in the application.

The institutional official signing the application further certifies that the Lead Institution will be accountable both for the appropriate use of any funds awarded and for the performance of the grant-supported project or activities resulting from this application. The Lead Institution may be liable for the reimbursement of funds associated with any inappropriate or fraudulent conduct of the project activity.

For funded grants, it is the responsibility of the institution to immediately report to ACS any action including recertification or loss of IRB approval that occurs during the term of the award that is related to the work described in the grant application.

By accepting an award, the Lead PI agrees to the Guidelines for Maintaining Research and Peer Review Integrity that can be found in the Appendix of these policies.

B. LEAP-RESEARCH SCHOLAR GRANT

Description: Research Scholar Grants (RSG) provide support for independent, self-directed

The American Cancer Society does not assume responsibility for the conduct of the activities that the grant supports, or for the acts of the grant recipient, because both are under the direction and control of the grantee institution and subject to its medical and scientific policies.

Every grantee institution must safeguard the rights and welfare of individuals who participate as subjects in research activities by reviewing proposed activities through an institutional review board

No voting member of a

the ACS is noted as a funding source. In turn, you agree to provide any materials featuring the ACS and RRP logos upon our request.

Falsification is defined as manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.¹

The research record is defined as the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry. It includes, but is not limited to, research proposals, laboratory records (both physical and electronic), progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, and journal articles.¹

Plagiarism is defined as the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.

Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.¹

Reported Qualifications must be accurate (e.g., years since degree earned).

1.2 Research Misconduct by Peer Review Committee Members

Any inquiries to a peer review panel member regarding an application from an applicant, PI, Co-PI, consultant, or their mentor, to a member of a peer review committee or the ACS Council for Extramural Grants must be reported immediately to the Scientific Director.

All materials related to the review process must be destroyed or given to the Program Manager at the end of the review meeting.

For purposes of this standard, materials related to the review process include, but are not limited to paper, bound volumes, flash drives, electronic files accessed via the internet, and oral presentations or discussions.

1.4 Conflict of Interest Standard for Reviewers

To preserve the integrity of the peer review process, all participants in the process must adhere to these principles and practices:

Reviewers must not be an employer or employee of an applicant and may not be employed by the same institution as an applicant within three years of the date of submission of an application.

Reviewers must not be a party to any agreement for future employment or other agreement or arrangement with an applicant or any person listed as key personnel on an application.

Reviewers must not have served as mentors or collaborators of an applicant within three years of the date of an application.

Reviewers must not participate in the review of an application submitted by a standing member of a peer review committee serving on the same review committee, with the exception of Institutional Research Grants.

Reviewers must not be under the health care of, or providing health care to, an applicant or any person listed as key personnel on an application.

Reviewers must not have received, or have the potential to receive, direct financial benefit from the application.

Reviewers must not be pursuing research projects which might be viewed as being in direct competition with applicants or their collaborators and colleagues. Nor should a reviewer have potential to receive direct benefit from an application's rejection.

evaluate the allegation and make a determination on the misconduct issue and the appropriate next steps to be taken to engage in further investigation or action in accordance with Article III, section 3.1.1, "Procedure for Handling Allegations of Scientific Misconduct by Applicants."

2.1.2 Scientific Misconduct by Grantees:

In instances where alleged scientific misconduct occurs after the awarding of a grant, such as in the publication of falsified data, the Scientific Director will bring the allegation to the attention of the Senior Vice President for Extramural Discovery Science at ACS. The Senior Vice President for Extramural Discovery Science will evaluate the allegation and make a determination of the appropriate steps to be taken to engage in further investigation or action as defined in Article III, section 3.1.2, "Procedure for Handling Allegations of Scientific Misconduct by Grantees."

2.1.3 Professional Misconduct by Grantees:

institutional procedures, it is the responsibility of the institution to contact the American Cancer Society regarding the allegation, any investigation of the allegation, and the outcome of that investigation. All such correspondence will be held in strict confidence and will not be made public by the American Cancer Society irrespective of the outcome of the investigation. The American Cancer Society assumes no responsibility in carrying out the investigation of scientific misconduct, or in determining an individual's innocence or guilt of the allegation of scientific misconduct. However, acceptance or nonacceptance of the findings of the institutional investigation is at the discretion of the Society, and additional clarification may be requested.

Allegations of scientific misconduct in a grant application may be made by individuals who are colleagues, trainees, or reviewers. In the instance that an allegation of scientific misconduct is made in reference to a grant application, the Senior Vice President for Extramural Discovery Science will contact the institutional official at the sponsoring research institution and seek to follow their established protocol for investigating such allegations. If an investigation is deemed necessary, it will be the responsibility of the sponsoring institution to carry out the investigation, to keep the ACS aware of the progress, and to report the outcome of the investigation to the Senior Vice President for Extramural Discovery Science. The written report should include findings, actions taken, and any pending actions.

In fairness to the applicant, the review process must continue while the allegation of scientific misconduct undergoes assessment. Review may continue either in the standing review committee or under the By-pass to Council review mechanism. Under no circumstance should a reviewer, Scientific Director, or ACS staff raise the issue of the allegation in a peer review meeting or meeting of ACS Council for Extramural Discovery Science. If that were to occur, review of that application could not be completed without bias; and review of the application must therefore be discontinued immediately and deferred to ad hoc reviewers or the ACS Council for Extramural Grants. If a reviewer suspects scientific misconduct, which is discovered at the time of the meeting,

3.1.3 Procedure for Handling Professional Misconduct by Grantees:

For purposes of this subsection, the following definitions apply:

Finding/Determination: (1) the final disposition of a matter under organizational policies and processes, to include the exhaustion of permissible appeals; or (2) a conviction of a sexual offense in a criminal court of law.

Administrative leave/Administrative action: any temporary/interim suspension or permanent removal of an individual, or any administrative action imposed on an individual by the grantee under organizational policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations, or executive orders, relating to activities, including but not limited to, teaching, advising, mentoring, research, management/administrative duties, or presence on campus.

The grantee's institution is required to notify ACS (1) of any finding/determination regarding the principal investigator (PI) or co-PI that demonstrates a violation of grantee policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations, or executive orders relating to sexual harassment, other forms of harassment, sexual assault, or other professional misconduct; and/or (2) if the PI or co-PI is placed on administrative leave or if any administrative action has been imposed on the PI or any co-PI by the awardee relating to any finding/determination or an investigation of an alleged violation of grantee policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations, or executive orders relating to sexual harassment, other forms of harassment, sexual assault, or other professional misconduct. Such notification must be submitted to the Senior Vice President for Extramural Discovery Science within ten days of (1) the finding/determination, (2) the date of the placement of the PI or co-PI on administrative leave, or (3) the date of the imposition of an administrative action, whichever is sooner. Each notification must include the following information:

ACS grant number;

Name of individual being reported;

Type of notification (choose one):

- Finding/determination that the reported individual has been found to have violated grantee policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations, or executive orders relating to sexual harassment, other forms of harassment, or sexual assault; or
- Placement by the grantee of the reported individual on administrative leave or the imposition of any administrative action on the individual by the grantee relating to any finding/determination or an investigation of an alleged violation of awardee policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations, or executive orders relating to sexual harassment, other forms of harassment, or sexual assault;

Description of the finding/determination and action(s) taken, if any; and,

Reason(s) for, and conditions of, placement of the individual on administrative leave or imposition of administrative action.

If (1) the institution notifies ACS of a finding of professional misconduct by a grantee, or (2) the institution notifies ACS that administrative action has been taken against a grantee because of a finding/determination that the grantee committed professional misconduct, ACS will consider the policy violation findings on a case-by-case basis. ACS may respond to a misconduct finding by, but not limited to, substituting or removing principal investigators or co-principal investigators, reducing award funding, and--where neither of those options are available or adequate--suspending or terminating awards. If the award is terminated, any residual funds, as of the date of notification, must be returned to ACS. The grantee may no longer be eligible to participate in ACS funded

awards, either as principal investigator, co-investigator, collaborator, mentor, or consultant. The grantee may also not be eligible to serve in any capacity in reviewing ACS grant proposals.

If the institution notifies ACS of administrative action taken against a grantee pending an investigation of an allegation of professional misconduct and the investigator has an active ACS award, funding of that award will be suspended until the allegation has either been confirmed or determined to be erroneous. If the allegation is determined not to have merit, the award may be reinstated by ACS at the date of notification of those findings by the sponsoring institution. If the allegation of professional misconduct is confirmed, ACS will consider the policy violation findings on a case-by-

APPENDIX B: INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING DELIVERABLES

GRANT ACTIVATION FORMS ANNUAL PROGRESS/FINAL REPORTS TRANSFER REQUEST CHANGE OF INSTITUTION CHANGE OF TERM EXTENSION OF TERM GRANT CANCELLATION CHANGE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR REPORTS OF EXPENDITURES

The American Cancer Society subscribes to the Altum ProposalCentral **Post Award Management System** to facilitate management ACS grants. The system is designed to collect and store grant information from grantees. Grantees are asked to keep their ProposalCentral profile current for the duration of the grant.

The site will house all reports, requests and correspondence pertaining to a grant and is accessible to both ACS staff and grantees. Grantees may provide access to others at their institution (e.g. grants officers) using the instructions provided below.

All awardees of an ACS grant will need to upload deliverables to ProposalCentral. The first deliverable we will be collecting through the **Post Award Management System** is the “Activation Form.” For the Activation Form **only**, please also email Greta McShan at greta.mcshan@cancer.org and cc: grants@cancer.org notifying her that you have uploaded your Grant Activation Form.

Uploading an Award Deliverable

- Log onto <https://proposalcentral.com/>
- **PI must enter their ProposalCentral username and password in “Applicant Login” to access their award detail information**
- Click on the “Awarded” link or “all Proposal” link
- In the Status column, click on the “Award Details” link
- On the Award Details screen, click on the “Deliverables” link at the bottom of the screen
- The schedule of deliverables due for the award is shown chronologically
- Click “Save” to upload the deliverable. You can replace the uploaded document with another document by clicking “Browse” again, selecting a different document from your computer files and clicking “Save” (adding description of deliverable is optional).
- Click “Close”

Send Email (Correspondence) to an ACS Administrator

- To send correspondence to a Scientific Director at the ACS, click the “Correspondence” link from the Award Details screen
- From this page, you can see any correspondence that has already been sent by clicking the blue link in the Message column
- Use the “Respond” link to respond directly to a message you have received
- To send a new message, click “Send Correspondence to Scientific Director” at the top of the page

- Select the administrator(s) who should receive the correspondence email
- Enter a subject and text for the correspondence in the spaces provided
-