

**YEAR 2
PROGRESS REPORT FOR BENCH-TO-BEDSIDE (BTB) PROJECT**

Instructions: Please complete this form and upload it in proposalCentral (<https://proposalcentral.altum.com/default.asp>). Instructions for uploading this form and accompanying materials (e.g., publications) in proposalCentral can be found on pages 1 – 4 of the Post Award Instruction Manual (https://proposalcentral.altum.com/Instructions_Award_Info.pdf).

Please contact proposalCentral (1-800-875-2562) with proposalCentral-related questions, or Julie Orlando or Pat Piringner (benchtobedside@nih.gov) with proposalCentral or program-related questions.

Project Title:

Years of Award:

Lead Intramural PI:

Name:

Degree:

Institute:

Lead Extramural PI:

Name:

Degree:

Institution:

Please list other associate investigators:

Name	Institution

Part 1 of 5: Progress Report Summary

Instructions: The summary of your progress should not exceed two pages, exclusive of tables and figures. The report should follow the outline and numbering system shown below.

A. Studies and Results

Describe the accomplishments toward each specific aim during Year 2, including the results obtained.


C. Significance

Emphasize the significance of the findings to the scientific field and their potential impact on health, if applicable.

D. Plans

Summarize your future plans for this work, and describe how the BtB funding enabled progress in your research. Please describe any publications, inventions and other related accomplishments resulting from this project.

Part 1 of 5: Progress Report Summary (continued)



Part 1 of 5: Progress Report Summary (continued)

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, occupying most of the page. It is intended for the user to enter the progress report summary content.

Part 2 of 5: Bench-to-Bedside Program Assessment

Funds Distribution Assessment in Year 2 of your project:

	Yes	No	Explain
In Year 2 of your project, did you receive funding in a timely manner to conduct your project as planned?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Were you able to use funds as anticipated in your proposal?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Were funds adequate to complete your project and meet objectives?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Did you need to re-allocate funding during the project? If yes, please explain.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

Do you have any suggestions to improve program management?

Part 3 of 5: Accompanying Materials

If you have supporting materials to accompany this progress report (e.g., protocol information, publications, etc.), submit these documents along with your report through proposalCentral.

Please indicate the number of publications resulting from this project:

Please list the names of the resulting publications:

Part 4 of 5: Summary of Accomplishments To-Date:

Activity	Number Resulting from BtB	Name(s)
Invention reports		
Patents pending		
Patents awarded		
New licensed drugs/devices or new indications for previously licensed drugs		
New grants or additional funding to support project long term		

Please provide the following information on any protocols resulting from BtB funds: (Please include protocols which are partially funded by other sources, e.g., existing protocols).

Protocol:

Please check the appropriate box:

New Protocol

Amended Protocol

Date of Protocol Approval or Amendment:

Study Title:

Protocol Number:

Protocol Institution:

Additional Protocol site(s):

If your project is pre-clinical and does not involve human subjects, will it evolve into a clinical protocol in the near future? (3-5 sentences if applicable):

	#	Comment
Number of new patients accrued as a result of BtB funding:		
Additional accruals expected as a result of BtB funds:		

Part 5 of 5: Evaluation of BtB Collaborations

Satisfaction with collaboration (both intramural-only and intramural-extramural collaborations):

	1 Inadequate	2 Poor	3 Satisfactory	4 Good	5 Excellent
Acceptance of new ideas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communication among collaborators	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to capitalize on the strengths of different researchers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Organization or structure of collaborative teams	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Resolution of conflicts among collaborators	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to accommodate different working styles of collaborators	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Involvement of collaborators from outside your home institution / institute.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Involvement of collaborators from diverse disciplines	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Impact of collaboration: (both intramural-only and intramural-extramural collaborations)

	1 Inadequate	2 Poor	3 Satisfactory	4 Good	5 Excellent
Productivity of collaboration meetings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Productivity in developing new products (e.g., papers, proposals, courses)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall productivity of collaboration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Not sure	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
In general, collaboration has improved your research productivity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In general, collaboration has improved the quality of your research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaboration did not pose a significant time burden in your research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*ratings adapted from L. Masse, R. Moser, et.al. 2008. *Am J Prev Med*; 35 (2S): 151-160.

Please comment on your extramural partnerships: (if applicable)

	Choose one	Comment
Was the idea for your project initiated by the intramural, extramural, or both investigators?		
Was it difficult for you (as intramural PI) to identify extramural collaborators for this project?		
Were you contacted by an extramural investigator to serve as the Intramural PI?		
Did the outside partner add value?		
Did basic and clinical collaborations lead to long-term relationships?		
Was there an exchange of fellows between intramural and extramural labs as a result of the collaboration?		
Was it difficult to form collaborative partnerships for this project?		
Did intramural and extramural investigators visit each other during the project?		
Did the project stimulate new sabbaticals for either intramural or extramural investigators?		
Did intramural patients go to extramural sites? If so, for what purpose?		
Did extramural patients come to the NIH Clinical Center? If so, for what purpose?		
Did project result in intramural investigators being recruited to extramural institutions/positions or vice versa?		
Were communications with extramural partners facilitated by this award?		
Did this award promote awareness of NIH and CC resources for your extramural partners?		
Did medical students participate in the project?		
Did the Bench-to-Bedside award result in a long term project that continued (will continue) after Bench-to-Bedside funding?		