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RWJF Nurse Faculty Scholars - Purpose

• Develop the next generation of national leaders in academic nursing through career development awards for outstanding junior nursing faculty.

• Strengthen the academic productivity and overall excellence of nursing schools by providing mentorship, leadership training, salary and research support to young faculty.
NFS Key Dates and Deadlines

• October 15, 2013 – Call for proposals launched
• February 12, 2014 – Proposals Deadline
• February 21 – March 28, 2014 – Proposals reviewed and scored by the NFS National Advisory Committee (NAC)
• April 23, 2014 – Notification of semi-finalists
• June 2-4, 2014 – NAC semi-finalist interviews
• June 12, 2014 – Notification of finalists
• September 1, 2014 – Appointments begin
Eligibility Criteria

• Registered nurse with a research doctorate in nursing or a related discipline.

• Junior faculty member in an accredited school of nursing in an academic position that could lead to tenure.

• Candidates must not receive support from other research fellowships and/or traineeships at time they begin the program.

• Because they already have demonstrated research expertise, former or current principal investigators on an NIH R01 research project or the equivalent are not eligible to apply.

• Identify at least one senior leader in the school of nursing as a primary nursing mentor for academic career planning and access to organizations, programs and colleagues helpful to the candidate’s work as a Nurse Faculty Scholar.
Eligibility Criteria (continued)

- Identify at least one senior researcher in the university with similar or complementary research interests, strongly encouraged to be from a discipline outside of nursing.
- Candidates must be citizens or permanent residents of the United States or territories at the time of application.
- We embrace racial, ethnic and gender diversity and encourage applications from candidates with diverse backgrounds.
Selection Criteria

• Evidence of potential for and strong *(long-term)* commitment to a full career as an academic nurse leader, with the capacity to achieve rank of full professor.

• Evidence that nominating institution and its senior leadership are committed to supporting the candidate’s academic career and activities during the program.

• Evidence of availability and commitment of qualified mentors and academic resources, including space as appropriate, at the candidate’s institution.

• Evidence of potential to become a national leader in scholarly focus area.
Selection Criteria (continued)

• Evidence of commitment to teaching excellence.

• Evidence of commitment to racial, ethnic, gender and cultural diversity in nursing.

• Merit of candidate’s proposed research/scholarly plan.

• Potential of the proposed research and scholarship area to serve as a foundation for the candidates academic career and contribution to: nursing science, interdisciplinary knowledge in a focus area; and improvement of health and health care in the United States
Submission Statistics – 2014

• 56 proposals submitted
• 55 proposals reviewed by the National Advisory Committee
• 21 semi-finalists selected for interview
• 12 finalists selected
Disqualification for Technical Compliance or Ineligibility

Eligibility:

• Candidate had less than 2 years or greater than 5 years in a faculty position that could lead to tenure after having completed their doctorate as of the start of the program

Technical Compliance:

• No candidates in 2014 were disqualified on the basis of not meeting technical compliance (e.g., not meeting page limits, letter missing)
Non-Advancement to Semi-Finalist

• Weaknesses in Proposal
  
  – Incongruence in proposal; disjointed research
    • “Outcomes seemed weak, too broad”
    • “Seemed to be totally switching topics from dissertation without good rationale”
    • “Description of the study, intervention and actual procedures confusing”

  – Abstract non-substantive
    • “Abstract should contain summary of details of methods such as sample size”

  – Lack of justification for sample size – e.g. power analysis for quantitative aims; lack of sample size justification for qualitative analysis

  – Sample size too small with limited proposal scope/vision; must be substantive research proposal
    • “Too narrow scholarly approach and structure of research”
    • “Unlikely to add anything substantively new”
    • “Only one school… (or one hospital)… being studied therefore limiting scope”
Non-Advancement to Semi-Finalist

• Weaknesses in Proposal (continued)
  – Protocol/s complicated and undeliverable
    • “Great idea for project, but poorly designed”
    • “Proposal is reasonable, but contains many different surveys and scores, not sure how they fit together”
    • “Intervention underspecified; applicant fails to consider other, existing interventions of a similar nature”
  – Insufficient case as to potential of study as part of research program to improve health and healthcare or create a culture of health in the United States (including direct clinical relevance of lab research)
    – “Lack of clear vision of potential impact of the research”
  – Weaknesses in methodology
    – Challenges and barriers to conducting research and how will address not fully articulated – e.g. selection bias or high risk of loss to follow-up
    – Poor articulation of methodology “lacked methodological detail”
    – “Aims don't stand alone without considerable explanation.”
Non-Advancement to Semi-Finalist

• Weaknesses in Proposal (continued)

– Insufficient specificity about questions, methods, and data analysis
– Insufficient logical connections among parts of proposal (e.g. prior research, conceptual framework, questions/hypotheses, methods and analysis)
  – “Proposal does not explain the work and tools utilized”
– Failure to substantiate use of key measures (e.g., with psychometric stats, citations to use in similar populations or for similar purposes) and to explain any conceptual/theoretical models introduced and how used in the research
– Failure to have read, synthesized and/or fails to acknowledge relevant prior research from all disciplines so that this research is a logical next step - not a repeat of already completed research -
– Some aspects seemed to be an illogical add-on – e.g. genetics/genomics because a current nursing research topic not because it was logical within study proposed or addition of cost-effectiveness analysis or “big data” (EMR’s) or certain physiological measures without good integration into proposal & prior research in field or without plan to get skills to add
Non-Advancement to Semi-Finalist

• Mentorship

  – Letters did not elaborate a clear commitment and/or detailed plan for mentorship (communications, meetings, mentoring activities)
    • “Lack of clarity of roles in mentors’ letters”
    • “Mentors also have rich professional experience, but do not seem to have the methodological rigor”
  – Lack of academic leadership demonstrated on biosketch of primary mentor
    • “Uncertainty if proposed mentors can guide applicant through the process of getting external grants and developing career”

  – Poor match of research mentor to scholar – does not have to be exact but if not apparent from biosketch, areas of match need to be articulated in letter and/or candidate’s narrative

  – Lack of research leadership of research mentor as demonstrated by publications, grantsmanship, and other benchmarks
    • “Mentors without current/recent funding experience”
Non-Advancement to Semi-Finalist

• Lack of Academic Leadership Potential
  – Lack of or limited publications on biosketch (dissertation not published)
    • “Few publications and/or not enough (e.g., only 1-2) as first-author”
    • “None of preliminary studies cited published nor accepted for publication”
  – Lack of prior small research funding and completion to publication
  – Limited research education and/or experience
  – Teaching goals non-specific; not well-described commitment to teaching
  – Unilateral focus on one element of leadership in academic nursing (e.g., research without attention to excellence in teaching)
  – Lack of indication of academic research plans after award
Non-Advancement to Semi-Finalist

• Diversity
  – Application did not address sufficiently commitment to racial, ethnic, gender and cultural diversity in nursing
    • Is not reflective of RWJF mission and vision
    • Can be through committee membership, relevant organizational leadership, recruitment or retention activities of students and/or faculty, mentorship of minority faculty and/or students, and/or strong teaching in areas of culture, health disparities
    • Research proposal is not attentive to issues of diversity &/or health inequities throughout the research process – all steps
    • “Does not describe attention to diversity in proposal”

• General Issues
  – Unclear institutional commitment
  – Not following guidelines of NIH biosketch in terms of publications
  – Missing documents such as a letter from a mentor or mentor CV
Non-Advancement to Finalist – Application

• Weaknesses in Proposal
  – Responses overly general - not concise, not providing specifics
  – Poor articulation of plans for use of RWJF NFS resources for leadership development across domains in academic nursing
    • “How will NFS help shape your career goals?”
    • “What are your research goals beyond NFS?”
  – Problems answering questions about the research plan
    • “What’s your theoretical framework & how will you link to your study”
  – Nothing new or innovative in research – will become problem in securing future funding
    • “What big question do you want to answer?”
  – Insufficient scientific rationale for intervention
    • “How will your research advance nursing science?”
  – Lack of understanding of evidence needed to translate research to policy
  – Lack of sufficient potential of impact of study
  – “Atheoretical” or inappropriate theory
  – Not enough reflection on IOM Future of Nursing Recommendations or RWJF’s Culture of Health
  – Translational Components
    • Not able to clearly articulate translation from biological/behavioral/individual to wider clinical care/population care/culture of health
Non-Advancement to Finalist – Application

• Mentorship
  – Non-research intensive environment without sufficient commitment from mentors
  – Mentors accomplished, but either not senior in SON (primary mentor) or case not made for research mentor’s area of research match with applicant
  – Research mentors not well-funded or have no large funding experience
  – Research mentors do not have good publication record
Non-Advancement to Finalist – Interview Issues

• Lack of Academic Leadership Potential
  – Unilateral focus on research to the exclusion of teaching or other aspects of academic leadership
    • Sounding as though anxious to “buy out of teaching” or get enough research funding so that not teaching anymore to any extent
    • “How do you (plan to) balance research, teaching, and service?”
  – Lack of teaching experience, especially without clear plan to become more active in teaching undergraduates as well as graduates
  – Lack of vision about career trajectory and goals
    • Academic leadership broadly – no clear passion about full spectrum of academic role
    • Where program of research is headed to improve health and health care in the United States
    • Could not identify how NFS will advance their career
    • Could not answer “What will you be an expert in in 10 years?”
    • Could not identify a nursing role model
Non-Advancement to Finalist – Interview Issues

• Diversity
  – Poor articulation of commitment and sensitivity to diversity (gender, race/ethnicity) issues to shape academic nursing role in 21st century
    • Lack of understanding of student body and community context
    • Student and faculty recruitment and retention
    • Attention to diversity and cultural issues in research
    • Diversity and cultural issues in teaching
    • Lack of understanding of health inequities and role of social determinants of health
    • *Could not answer well what diversity means to you and your project*
    • “No evidence of involvement in diversity initiatives at institution”
    • “Could not describe how was addressing diversity in research role or educator role”
  – Not recognizing heterogeneity within racial groups
  – Not able to define how culture/diversity affects study all aspects of research process
Non-Advancement to Finalist – Interview Issues

• Inability to Answer Broader-View Questions

  – Perceived benefits of NFS program:
    • “What can NFS give you that you can’t get at your home university?”
  – View of future role as academic nurse leader:
    • “As a 21st Century nursing leader, how do SON faculty need to change?”
    • “How do/will you pay it forward?”
    • “How will your work impact health care policy and practice on a national level?”
    • “What global role should nursing have in the future?”
  – Work with interdisciplinary teams:
    • “What lessons have you learned?”
    • “What do you bring as a nurse to interdisciplinary teams?”
    • “What ‘s an active ingredient for engaging stakeholders?”
Tips from Successful Candidates and Their institutions (continued)

• Articulating One’s Career Path and Potential for Leadership
  – Articulating professional goals for the three-year scholarship and the future, making sure it reflects selection criteria
  – Obtaining input from one’s Dean and mentors on professional goals for teaching, research, and service so these are addressed in letters of support
  – Identify and provide evidence of one's personal leadership strength and evidence of leadership potential
Tips from Successful Candidates and Their institutions (continued)

• Support for Proposal Development

  – Writing and re-writing, then revisiting to assess whether articulation of one’s career trajectory is clear; then revising with input of mentors
  – Proposals address the “So what?” question
  – Well-rounded in scholarship, practice, leadership, and service activities
  – Ability to connect dots between proposed research and impact on health of Americans, nursing science, interdisciplinary research, translating from bench to bedside practice with ability to show improved health outcomes
  – Solid research plan with societal value; well articulated and has relevance for health care and policy
  – Look at RWJF website for purposes of foundation, priority areas, etc. – remember they fund you!
  – Look at www.rwjfnursefacultyscholars.org – see what we brag about – our scholars, achievements, what our program might do for you
Other Tips from the National Program Office

• Application Process

– Review selection and eligibility criteria closely. Please verify with the National Program Office if you are not sure.
– Provide ample guidance to proposed mentors and others writing letters to meet selection criteria.
– Start early to avoid delays with online application technology.
– Leave enough time to carefully check to make sure application meets technical requirements and all elements are included; double check after submitting.
– Follow directions given on templates, especially in regard to uploading of PDF documents.
Other Tips from the National Program Office (continued)

• Interview Process
  – Be prepared to discuss limitations of research proposal.
  – Answer questions concisely (know when to put a period to your comments).
  – Give substantive answers to questions – use examples to make a point versus generalities.
  – Make sure responses are thoughtful answers to specific questions you are asked rather than rehearsed generalities.
  – Be prepared to discuss the entire of your future role as academic nurse leader.
Updates from RWJF

• Four New RWJF Programs – to start in 2015
  – New Clinical Scholars
  – Interdisciplinary Culture of Health Research Leaders
  – Diversity in Health Policy Research
  – Multi-Sector Leaders for Health

• RWJF Programs Not Closing
  – Future of Nursing Scholars
  – Harold Amos Medical Faculty Development Program
  – Health Policy Fellows

• Active RWJF Call for Proposals
  – Designing the Next Generation of Human Capital Programs – due July 1st
  – Public Health Services and Systems Research – due July 23
  – Changes in Health Care Financing and Organization - Open
  – Changes in Health Care Financing and Organization: Small Grants - Open

Sign up for RWJF Funding Alerts: [http://www.rwjf.org/services/](http://www.rwjf.org/services/)