

# Why American Heart:

- no US residency requirement – foreign students/postdocs welcome
- similar pay but 10K health insurance

Program	FY 21-22
AHA/Enduring Hearts Research Awards in Pediatric Heart Transplantation	n/a
AHA Institutional Research Enhancement Award (AIREA)	30%
Bugher Foundation Stroke Center	n/a
Career Development Award	29%
Children's Heart Foundation Awards	12%
Collaborative Sciences Award	17%
COVID CV Consequences	10%
Established Investigator Award	20%
Health Equity Research Network	8%
Innovative Project Award	n/a
Institutional Award for Undergraduate Student Training	25%
Merit Award	n/a
Postdoctoral Fellowship	25%
Predoctoral Fellowship	26%
Research Goes Red Awards for Health-Related Social Needs	50%
Research Supplement to Promote Diversity in Science	100%
Strategically Focused Research Networks	33%
Testing the Impact of Social Determinants of Health on CV Risks and Outcomes	17%
Transformational Project Award	16%

Success rate is the percent of proposals funded.

## Educational:

*the focus is not a delivery of outcomes defined in Specific Aims.*

## Criteria:

- **relevance** to AHA goals: – broadly defined, but it cannot be a gimmick.
- **applicant:** very detailed (GREs, undergrad transcripts)
- **mentor:** mentor cannot ride on his/her past educational performance. There has to be specific and detailed Educational Plan (Group meetings; Journal Clubs are NOT enough.) *(The more thoughtful is Educational Plan → the more effort PI put into the AHA application → the bigger is PIs commitment to the applicant)*

## Criteria cntd. Research Project

- **Research plan:** decent, but make sure that it is not overreaching - it is NOT an R01. Also, reviewers expect significant preliminary data.
- **Clarity and organization:** clear thinking organized student/postdoc is a must
- **Critical:** address potential pitfalls and the ways to deal with them (a must for more advanced applications)
- **Educational:** The research plan should be educational: if you happened to be an expert in the field (postdocs might be) make sure that you emphasize new things/new approaches.
- **Career advancement:** make connection how this particular project fits with your career development.

## Evaluation: 3-legged stool analogy

- applicant / mentor / project
- balance is very important:
  - saw great students, great research but not convinced about commitment of the PI [EXAMPLE – same letter from PI for two different candidates)
  - great mentor, great research but the applicant failed organic chemistry as a undergrad. [explain if there are mitigating circumstances]
  - (students coming from the Universities using English grading system: mention different grade scales – there are online calculators that let you convert from a non-4.0 scale to the US scale)

## Odds and Ends

- **Panels** are very uneven, wide spectrum of opinions some competent other not quite.
- **Roulette**: unpredictability of the process – it is subjective
- **Resubmission**: panels change every year, resubmissions especially with explicitly the addressed improvements are always scored differently.

## More odds and ends

- **motivation:** why even applying ?
- You get a little financial benefit. It is mainly for your mentor benefit who does not have to spend grant money to support you. But it enhances your CV.
- Learning to write a good grant is a life skill if you wish to join the academy, as it were.

## parting advice:

- do not alienate or try to bamboozle the panel. They will know if you are repurposing an NRSA.