

# Call for Proposals

## Collaborative Research at the Intersection of Cybersecurity and Healthcare

**Date of Announcement: November 16, 2021**

**Applications Due: February 1, 2021**

Personalized Healthcare Technology SIRA (PHT180) and the Global Cybersecurity Institute (GCI) are pleased to announce a joint seed funding opportunity for collaborative research projects at the intersection of healthcare and cybersecurity. Recognizing the increasing opportunities and innovation potential for interdisciplinary research addressing challenges in cybersecurity and healthcare, this seeding funding program is established to encourage and promote the collaboration between teams of RIT faculty working in these two broad disciplines.

**Program overview:** Proposals responsive to this CFP should include:

- Interdisciplinary research projects at the intersection of cybersecurity and healthcare research
- Multidisciplinary research team including PIs working in the general disciplines of cybersecurity and healthcare. Teams of established or new collaborations are both encouraged to apply.
- Early-stage research efforts that have clear merit and potential to succeed, but are not yet ready for development into an external grant proposal.
  - The funds should be used to do the work necessary to demonstrate project merit/feasibility and research expertise that are essential for successful external grant applications.
- Clear justification of the value and impact of collaboration, and inclusion of a brief collaboration plan.

**Anticipated award amount:** Up to \$20,000 per award for multi-PI collaborations, with budget justification commensurate with funding scale. Projects are for one year.

**Required Proposal Elements:**

- Project description (5 pages not including references): in PDF format including standard proposal elements such as intro, background, related work, proposed ideas, and evaluation plan.
- Project summary (1 page)

- Collaboration plan (1 page)
- High-level budget
- Biosketches of the key personnel

**Application Process:** Please submit proposals to [pht180@rit.edu](mailto:pht180@rit.edu) by February 1. Applications will be jointly reviewed by PHT180 and GCI in February and March 2022 and notification to awardees will be made in early-to-mid April 2022. A multi-step review process will be employed, where revisions may be requested by the review panel in order for the revised proposal to be considered for awards.

**Terms and Conditions:**

- **Reporting:** Awardees will be expected to submit a report within 60 days of conclusion of the project. The report should include a brief summary of efforts to gain external funding, completed research activities, outcomes, changes, future plans, and summary of expenditure. Awardees will also be expected to present their project outcome at a PI meeting that will be planned after the conclusion of the project. PIs must consent to PHT180 and GCI disseminating major outcomes and conclusions via RIT websites and news outlets.
- **External funding:** Awards are expected to lead to future external funding proposals affiliated with both PHT180 and GCI.

**Primary Point of Contact:** The primary point of contact for PHT180 is Gina Lamanna ([pht180@rit.edu](mailto:pht180@rit.edu)), Research Administrator for PHT180. The primary point of contact for GCI will be hired soon. They will work with awardees post-award to coordinate the financial aspects of each project.

### Proposal Reviewing Rubric

**Note:** An otherwise Excellent proposal with one weak area might not be funded.

Criteria	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
<b>Proposed Ideas</b>	The research problem or the corresponding steps forward are not sufficiently important, interesting, or novel. The	Reasonably interesting research problem, but it may not be strongly novel, or the proposed work may lack the potential for strong papers.	Compelling research problem with at least one solid idea of how to advance the work and potential for a high-quality publication. It may not be as novel or show as much potential as top proposals. The	Compelling research problem with clear directions for how to move forward and strong potential for high-quality publications. Highly

	interdisciplinary nature is low.	Reasonably interdisciplinary.	interdisciplinary nature is clear	interdisciplinary ideas.
<b>Funding Plan</b>	The funding plan is either vague or not realistic about how to get external funds.	Clear and realistic plan to get funding. The plan may lack good alternatives in case the first path to funding falls through.	Clear and realistic plan with multiple avenues to getting funding. The plan may not show good evidence that the targeted agencies will be interested in this problem, but it is plausible.	Clear and realistic plan with multiple avenues to getting funding and evidence that the targeted agencies fund related work.
<b>PI Preparation</b>	It is rather unclear that the PIs can execute this project or deliver strong outcomes. The need and multidisciplinary composition of the team is not justified.	The PIs have demonstrated most of the ability needed to execute the project, though some additional expertise may be helpful, and can generate solid publications and grant applications. The team is clearly multidisciplinary but may need additional expertise.	The PIs are well prepared to execute the project and should be able to build on the results to create high-quality publications and grant applications, but they may not yet have a strong funding record or may be new to the sub-topic. The multidisciplinary team has clear complementary expertise.	The PIs are very well prepared to execute the project and obtain external funds based on the results, as demonstrated by their publication and funding record. The multidisciplinary team has strong and clear complementary expertise.
<b>Proposal Quality</b>	The proposal is not clear enough or is missing critical information.	The proposal is mostly clear and mostly complete, but it has areas of weakness that should be addressed.	The proposal is clear and complete, and it shows signs that the PI can write fundable grant proposals.	The proposal is compelling, clear, and complete, and it shows signs that the PI can write excellent grant proposals.
<b>Collaboration Plan</b>	The mechanism to support successful collaboration is missing	There is some description of collaboration mechanism, but it can be made more concrete	The collaboration plan is clear and shows potential for success	The collaboration plan is clear with detailed mechanism in place to support success

