



YOSEMITE-AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY (YACS) AWARD POLICIES

EFFECTIVE MARCH 2026

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION DEADLINE: JUNE 24, 2026

Program Contact: yosemite@cancer.org

**YOSEMITE – AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY AWARD POLICIES
CONTENTS**

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. DESCRIPTION OF THE FUNDING OPPORTUNITY | 3 |
| 2. AUTHORITY FOR MAKING GRANTS..... | 4 |
| 3. SOURCE OF FUNDS | 4 |
| 4. TERM AND BUDGET | 4 |
| 5. WHO MAY APPLY | 4 |
| 6. TOBACCO-INDUSTRY FUNDING POLICY | 5 |
| 7. COLLABORATIONS WITH ACS DISCOVERY SCIENTISTS (IF APPLICABLE)..... | 5 |
| 8. ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES..... | 6 |
| 9. APPLICATION DEADLINE | 7 |
| 10. NOTIFICATIONS AND PEER REVIEW..... | 7 |
| 11. GRANT MANAGEMENT AND PAYMENTS | 7 |
| 12. ANNUAL AND FINAL PROGRESS REPORTS | 8 |
| 13. PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER GRANT-RELATED COMMUNICATIONS..... | 8 |
| 14. FINANCIAL RECORDS AND REPORTS | 9 |
| 15. EXPENDITURES | 10 |
| 16. OWNERSHIP OF EQUIPMENT..... | 10 |
| 17. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS | 10 |
| 18. REQUESTS FOR GRANT MODIFICATIONS..... | 12 |
| 19. CANCELLATION OF GRANT | 12 |
| APPENDIX A: GUIDELINES FOR MAINTAINING RESEARCH AND PEER REVIEW INTEGRITY | |
| 13 | |
| APPENDIX B: INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING DELIVERABLES | 23 |

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE FUNDING OPPORTUNITY

The **2026 Yosemite-American Cancer Society Award** supports innovative research to develop methodologies, establish feasibility, or pilot high risk/high reward projects to advance the prevention, diagnosis, or treatment of cancer as outlined below in either topic #1 or #2. Preliminary data are not required. Priority will be given to projects that are highly innovative, feasible within a two-year maximum timeframe, and are poised to make an impact on cancer prevention, treatment, and healthcare delivery by demonstrating a plan of *translation to the clinic*.

TOPIC #1 – Beyond the canonical proteome: post-transcriptional and post-translational regulation in cancer

Non-genetic regulation beyond DNA sequence and mRNA abundance can profoundly shape tumor biology, yet remains underexplored. These layers include alternative splicing, RNA modifications, non-canonical translation (e.g., cryptic peptides), and post-translational modifications (PTMs) such as glycosylation. This topic seeks proposals that reveal or therapeutically exploit these regulatory mechanisms to advance cancer detection or treatment, leading to actionable biomarkers or therapeutic strategies.

Project proposals can include, but are not limited to:

- Mapping actionable proteoform landscapes (e.g., tumor-specific glycan signatures, PTM patterns, splice-isoform proteoforms).
- Exploiting altered glycosylation, PTMs, or splice-isoforms for therapy.
- Linking glycosylation states, PTMs, or isoforms to cancer-related mechanisms (e.g. immune evasion or therapy resistance).
- Identifying or targeting non-canonical translation products (e.g. cryptic peptides, UTR-derived or alternative ORF peptides) as biomarkers or therapeutic targets.
- Therapeutically modulating pathways governing post-transcriptional or post-translational regulation to overcome resistance or enhance treatment efficacy.

TOPIC #2 – Induced Proximity and New Frontiers in Protein Modulation

Induced proximity has introduced a transformative paradigm in medicine, originating with targeted protein degradation (i.e. PROTACs and Molecular Glue Degraders), and more recently expanding into a broader array of applications beyond degradation. Extending this paradigm to drive novel biological outcomes has the potential to unlock novel mechanisms of action and address targets previously considered undruggable. We seek innovative platforms, chemistries, and mechanistic strategies that leverage induced proximity or related concepts to modulate protein function, especially in ways beyond degradation.

Project may include but are not limited to:

- Strategies that leverage induced proximity between cancer-relevant proteins to achieve functional outcomes beyond degradation, such as selective killing, inhibition, activation, stabilization, re-localization, epigenetic editing, and more.
- Tools or methods enabling the discovery of proximity-inducing molecules, especially the discovery of molecular glues.
- Approaches that exploit spatial organization and higher-order assembly, (e.g. clustering of receptors or ligands on the cell surface)
- Proof-of-concept studies that use genetic tools (e.g. engineered protein control systems to manipulate protein states) to identify or validate target combinations for therapeutic induced proximity applications.
- Creation of entirely new modes of small-molecule action, including allosteric binders/modulators, conformation trapping, clustering-based activation, and other strategies that modulate proteins without engaging active sites. Projects should aim to reveal or engineer new mechanistic principles that expand the druggable proteome.

2. AUTHORITY FOR MAKING GRANTS

Yosemite and ACS are equal partners in this award. All Yosemite-American Cancer Society Award grants are approved on behalf of ACS' Board of Directors and the authorized officers of Yosemite (collectively, "the Partners"). Oversight of the administration of the grant and related grant policies shall be managed by ACS, with the understanding that any questions related to such grant policies shall be subject to review, discussion, and determination by the Partners as it relates to Yosemite-American Cancer Society Awards.

3. SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funding for Yosemite-American Cancer Society Awards is made possible through equal partnership funding from Yosemite and ACS. ACS funds are principally obtained from public donations collected annually by ACS' many dedicated volunteers. As such, to disseminate information about ACS and this grant program to volunteers and the public, grantees may occasionally be asked to give brief presentations to professional and lay audiences.

4. TERM AND BUDGET

Yosemite-American Cancer Society Awards are funded up to \$300,000 total direct costs for two-year projects, plus 10% indirect costs. The maximum allowable budget is \$330,000 for the project period. Equipment that equals or exceeds \$5,000 with a useful life of more than one year is not included in the direct cost total used to calculate indirect costs. These grants are not renewable or transferrable.

Budgets submitted must reflect the funds required for the proposed research.

Resubmission: One resubmission is allowed for Yosemite-American Cancer Society Award proposals that were submitted and reviewed in 2024 or 2025 but were not funded. However, a resubmitted application **must fit within the current scientific scope of the RFA**. If the research plan is changed by approximately 50% or more from the initial submission, it is considered a new application and should be marked as such.

5. WHO MAY APPLY

Investigators at any career stage with a full-time faculty (or equivalent) appointment at one of the invited institutions (see Eligible Institutions in Section 8 below) are eligible to apply. Applications submitted from an institution that is not eligible will be withdrawn and returned without review.

Only one individual may be designated as principal investigator and thus, responsible and accountable for the overall conduct of the project.

Applicants may apply for multiple awards, but the scientific scope of the proposed projects **must** not overlap with each other or other funded projects. Projects are considered to overlap if there are any shared *Specific Aims or areas of the budget*. The Scientific Director of the ACS program office makes final decisions regarding any questions of overlap. Scientific Directors develop and manage a portfolio of grant opportunities in focused areas of cancer research. The Scientific Director provides leadership for the design and development of research programs and initiatives within his/her program area that create opportunities to advance cancer research on mission critical priorities. The Scientific Director oversees all functions of their research program, and the peer review committees contained therein.

In cases of overlap, the PI may accept only one award if both are approved for funding. Negotiation of partial funding of grants with overlapping specific aims is not permitted.

The only exceptions regarding overlap are:

- Funds provided by the institution as start-up support/part of the start-up package to develop a new laboratory; and

- Awards that provide only salary support for the Principal Investigator. In the latter case, if the salary support for the PI's contribution to the project is covered by the other agency, no additional salary support for the PI may be requested from this award.

6. TOBACCO-INDUSTRY FUNDING POLICY

Scientific investigators or individuals who are funded for any project by the tobacco industry are not eligible for this award. Those who accept tobacco-industry funding during the term of a grant must inform yosemite@cancer.org, whereupon the grant may be terminated.

Tobacco industry funding includes:

- Funds from a company that is engaged, or whose affiliates are engaged, in the manufacture of tobacco produced for human use;
- Funds in the name of a tobacco brand, whether or not the brand name is used solely for tobacco goods; and
- Funds from a body set up by the tobacco industry or by 1 or more companies in the industry.

The following do not constitute tobacco industry funding:

- Legacies funds from tobacco industry investments (unless the name of a tobacco company or cigarette brand is associated with them);
- Funds from a trust or foundation established with assets related to the tobacco industry, but which no longer have any connection with the industry, even though the entity may bear a name that for historical reasons is associated with the tobacco industry.

Tobacco industry funding is defined for purposes of this award as money provided or used for any costs for research, including personnel, consumables, equipment, buildings, travel, meetings, and conferences, or operating costs for laboratories and offices. It does not include meetings or conferences unrelated to a particular research project.

7. COLLABORATIONS WITH ACS DISCOVERY SCIENTISTS (IF APPLICABLE)

ACS Discovery intramural scientists and their staff ([Surveillance, Prevention, and Health Services Research](#); [Population Science](#)) may participate in grants and contracts in many ways, including:

- Serving as unpaid consultants, collaborators, co-investigators, or mentors. Intramural scientists may not serve as a principal investigator on an ACS grant or contract.
- Contributing to the conceptualization, design, execution, or interpretation of a research study.
- Having primary responsibility for a specific aim within a standard research grant mechanism.
- Developing or contributing data for an extramural collaboration.
- Participating in a multi-institutional collaborative arrangement with extramural researchers for clinical, prevention, or epidemiological studies.

ACS intramural scientists may not receive salary support, but can receive travel expenses, or other funds from ACS-funded grants or contracts.

In most cases, the use of ACS research resources requires that at least one ACS intramural scientist be included as a collaborator on the grant application. Therefore, prior to submission of an application, the collaboration between extramural scientists and intramural scientists must be established according to the policies and procedures of ACS intramural research.

Intramural and extramural scientists may have access to reagents, laboratory equipment, and/or data to conduct the extramurally funded portion of the research, as established in their collaborative agreement.

While intramural scientists may write a description of the work to be performed by the intramural department, they may not write an applicant's grant application or contract proposal. However, the intramural scientist(s) should review and approve sections relevant to the collaboration.

ACS intramural scientist participation must comply with disclosure, non-disclosure, and conflict-of-interest regulations.

8. ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Investigators from the following institutions are eligible to submit applications for a Yosemite-American Cancer Society Award: The Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR), California Institute of Technology, City of Hope, Columbia University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Duke University, ETH Zurich, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Harvard University, Institute of Protein Design of the University of Washington, Johns Hopkins University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Mayo Clinic, MD Anderson Cancer Center, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, Mount Sinai, Netherlands Cancer Institute (NKI), Peter MacCallum Cancer Center, The Rockefeller University, The Scripps Research Institute, Stanford University, University College London, University of California at Berkeley, University of California at San Francisco, University of Cambridge, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, University of Oxford, University of Pennsylvania, Washington University in St. Louis, and Yale University.

Subcontracting Institutions: Grants may include subcontracts with secondary institutions, including institutions not listed above. Subcontracts for the research project may be with public or private institutions, provided they do not violate the policies set forth herein (the “Policies”).

Institutional Responsibilities

The American Cancer Society and Yosemite do 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. The institution of the 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.

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 (IRB), as specified by the National Institutes of Health Office for Human Research Protections of the US Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Institutions located outside the United States must comply with US and international standards, and if conflicting standards exist, the higher standard must be used. An equivalent local agency must approve the research.

Furthermore, applicants, applicant institutions, and grantee institutions must adhere to DHHS guidelines as well as Partner guidelines regarding conflicts of interest, recombinant DNA, scientific misconduct, and all other applicable Partner policies and procedures.

To signify agreement with all Partner policies and procedures, an application for a grant must bear the e-signature of the principal investigator. Space is provided for e-signatures for the departmental chair (or equivalent) and institutional official to accommodate institution-specific requirements for proposal submissions, but neither are required for submission of this application. Note: the PI must enable other users’ access to the application on ProposalCentral to permit their e-signatures.

Once a grant is awarded, an institutional official signature is required signifying institutional agreement with all Partner policies and procedures. The institution is responsible for verifying that all documentation related to the grant is correct, including all representations made by any named researcher (e.g., position or title).

The institution is required to ensure IRB approval, or equivalent in the institution’s country, is obtained for the grant to start, and the approval documentation is uploaded into ProposalCentral within 3 months of grant activation. Furthermore, IACUC approval must be obtained before animal work begins. An IACUC approval letter must be uploaded to ProposalCentral within 3 months of grant activation.

It is the responsibility of the institution to immediately report to the Partners any finding that any information presented to ACS or Yosemite in connection with the application and/or grant is false. It

is also the responsibility of the institution to immediately report to the Partners any action including recertification, loss of certification, breach of contract, misconduct, or change in employment status for a named researcher with the institution. This includes administrative leave, which may occur during the term of any award, pertinent to the work described in the grant application.

Failure to abide by the terms above, or by any other Partner policy or procedure, may result in suspension or cancellation of the grant, at the collective discretion of the Partners.

By accepting a Yosemite – American Cancer Society award, you agree to the Guidelines for Maintaining Research and Peer Review Integrity found in the Appendix of these policies.

9. APPLICATION DEADLINE

Applications for grants and awards must be submitted electronically via ProposalCentral (see Instructions) by 11:59 PM ET on the specified deadline date. If the deadline falls on a weekend or holiday, the application deadline moves to the following business day.

No supplemental materials will be accepted after the deadline unless requested by the Partners or the reviewers. Note that the timeline may be shifted as needed by the Partners.

DEADLINE, REVIEW, NOTIFICATION, AND ACTIVATION SCHEDULE

| | Application Deadline | Peer Review Meeting | Notification | Grant Start |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Yosemite-American Cancer Society Award | June 24, 2026 | September 2026 | November 2026 | Jan 1, 2027 |

10. NOTIFICATIONS AND PEER REVIEW

After receipt of the application, applicants will receive an email acknowledgement providing an application number, the assigned peer review committee, and the name of their Scientific Director with contact information. This email will be sent to the email address in the professional profile supplied at the time of submission in ProposalCentral. Be certain the email address listed in your professional profile is active, since it will be used to notify you throughout the review and award process.

A special peer review committee, with all necessary subject matter expertise, will be created to review the Yosemite-American Cancer Society Award grant applications. Each application will be assigned to at least 2 scientific reviewers and one community research partner (usually no formal training as a scientist or health professional but has a strong personal interest in advancing the effort to control and prevent cancer through research) for independent and confidential review. Refer to the Yosemite-American Cancer Society Award application instructions for the evaluation criteria.

After the peer review committee discusses and scores the most competitive applications, it provides the application ranking, along with critiques of the applications and scores, to be utilized for making funding decisions.

Post-Review Notification. Applicants will receive the reviewers' critiques approximately 6 weeks after peer review. Final funding decisions will be communicated approximately 6-8 weeks after review.

11. GRANT MANAGEMENT AND PAYMENTS

New grantees will receive a packet of information with instructions for activating the award. The activation form as well as other important information about the grant can also be found at <https://proposalcentral.com/> (select the Award tab to see the Post Award Management site). The grant activation form must be submitted and processed before grant payments will start. A delay of start may be requested if this is not possible.

Grant payments will be made at the end of each month in equal monthly installments. Payments shall be made to the sponsoring institution via electronic funds transfer or via a mailed check depending on the preference selected on the grant activation form.

Acknowledgement of payment by the sponsoring institution is not required. Continued funding by the Partners throughout the grant period is contingent upon the institution's compliance with all terms related to the grant; failure to comply with all of the grant terms may result in a suspension or cancellation of the grant, to be determined by the Partners at their collective discretion.

Personnel compensated in whole or in part with funds from the Partners are not employees of the Partners. Consequently, institutions are responsible for issuing appropriate IRS tax filings, or equivalent for personnel at non-US institutions, for all individuals receiving compensation from the Partner grant, and for withholding and paying all required federal, state, and local payroll taxes for such compensation. Any tax consequences are the responsibility of the individual recipient and the sponsoring institution. We advise all grant and award recipients to consult a tax advisor regarding the status of their awards.

12. ANNUAL AND FINAL PROGRESS REPORTS

Annual and/or final reports represent a critical part of responsible stewardship of the donated dollars, and we greatly appreciate your assistance in fulfilling this important commitment to our donors. Information from these reports may be shared with donors under a Non-Disclosure Agreement. Therefore, do not include proprietary or confidential information. All progress reporting forms are available at <https://proposalcentral.com/> under the "Deliverables" tab.

- An annual progress report must be submitted each year within 60 days after the first and subsequent anniversaries of the start date of the grant. Additionally, the PI institution's Technology Transfer Officer (TTO) is required to submit an annual intellectual property report.
- A final progress report is due within 60 days after the grant has terminated. The final report should cover the entire grant period. In the event a grant is extended without additional funds or is terminated early, the final report is due 60 days after the new termination date of the grant.
- Grantees must submit reports in a timely manner. If this is not possible, a grantee must make a written request to extend the reporting deadline. Noncompliance may result in the withholding of payment on all grants in effect at the recipient institution until reports are received.

13. PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER GRANT-RELATED COMMUNICATIONS

When and how to acknowledge your grant:

Publications resulting from research or training activities supported by the Yosemite-American Cancer Society Award must contain the following acknowledgement: "Supported by [name of grant and number] from Yosemite and the American Cancer Society." When there are multiple sources of support, the acknowledgment should read "Supported in part by [name of grant and number] from Yosemite and the American Cancer Society," along with references to other funding sources. Please do not abbreviate the funders' names in the publication acknowledgement as this is used to track the impact of funded grants.

Yosemite and ACS support should also be acknowledged by the grantee and the institution in all public communication of work resulting from this grant, including scientific abstracts (where permitted), posters at scientific meetings, press releases or other media communications, and internet-based communications. Grantees are encouraged to notify their program office before public communication of their work so that external communication can be coordinated.

The grant award process registers new grants with Crossref and assigns a Digital Object Identifier (DOI) number to each. The DOI number will allow tracking and identification of publications, patents, and other work that resulted from this grant award. The DOI link in ProposalCentral is located on the Award Details page. Your Crossref DOI link leads to a page of publicly available information about

this grant award. The information on Crossref includes the grant number, the grant amount, the dates of the award, the title of the research project, the names of the investigators, the research institution, and the lay summary for the research.

The American Cancer Society requests the use of ORCID identifiers during the application and grant award processes. ORCID enables researchers to seamlessly track and share data between their record, funders, publishers, data repositories, and other research workflows. By virtue of accepting a Partner grant, the grant recipient agrees to allow the Partners permission to connect with their ORCID ID record.

Although there is no formal Partner approval process for publications by grantees, it is helpful to notify your Scientific Director when manuscripts have been accepted for publication. This will allow ample time for additional public notifications. If your institution plans a press release involving any of your Partner-supported research, please notify your Scientific Director in advance.

ACS and Yosemite grant to you a limited, revocable, non-transferable license to use their logos (as shown below) in association with your funded work. We encourage you to use them on scientific posters, PowerPoint presentations, and any other visual presentation about your funded work where this award is noted as a funding source. In turn, you agree to provide any materials featuring the ACS and Yosemite logos upon our request. Please use both side by side with similar dimensions. For questions, please contact Scientific Director before use.

Permission to use the logo is limited to the uses outlined in the above paragraph. It should not imply Partner endorsement of products such as guidelines, websites, software for mobile devices (apps), tool kits, and so on.



14. FINANCIAL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A report of expenditures must be submitted within 90 days of the grant's expiration date shown in the award letter; annual financial reports are not required. Funds remaining at the end of the first year are automatically carried over to the next year. For funds remaining at the end of the grant term, see Section 19 below regarding no-cost extensions. Any change in terms, such as a no-cost extension, will alter a report's due date. The necessary forms can be found under the "Deliverables" tab at <https://proposalcentral.com/>.

Signatures of the principal investigator and the institution's financial officer are required. Any unexpended funds must be returned to the Partners. Use the below mailing address to return unexpended funds:

Made payable to American Cancer Society
Moore RMG
ATTN: ACS Focus Factory/MP (Non-Rev)
100 Jamison Court
Hagerstown, MD 21740

Grantees must submit financial reports in a timely manner. If this is not possible, a grantee must make a written request to extend the reporting deadline. Noncompliance may result in the withholding of payment on all grants in effect at the recipient institution until reports are received.

Institutions must maintain separate accounts for each grant, with substantiating invoices available for audit by representatives of the Partners. The Partners are not responsible for expenditures made prior to the start date of the grant, costs incurred after termination or cancellation of the grant, costs incurred after the last date at the current institution, in the event of a transfer and, commitments

against a grant not paid within 60 days following the expiration date, or any expenditures that exceed the total amount of the award. (See also Section 20, "Cancellation.")

15. EXPENDITURES

This Yosemite-American Cancer Society Award is not designed to cover the total cost of the research proposed or the investigator's entire compensation. The grantee's institution is expected to provide the required physical facilities and administrative services normally available at an institution.

It is the recommendation of the Partners not to exceed the accumulated monthly installments of the grant. In the event of a cancellation or transfer, the institution is only entitled to the prorated amount of the award accumulated between the start and end dates (See Section 20, "Cancellation").

This award is flexible in response to the changing needs of a research program. The principal investigator may make minor budget alterations; changes less than \$15,000 per year do not require written approval from your Scientific Director.

Major changes in expenditures (>\$15,000 per year) require written approval from your Scientific Director. However, for permanent equipment, the annual threshold requiring written approval is >\$5,000. Contact your Scientific Director for guidance.

Indirect costs: The calculation of allowable indirect costs includes all budget items except permanent equipment. Equipment that equals or exceeds \$5,000 with a useful life of more than one year, is not included in the direct cost total used to calculate indirect costs. **Indirect costs may not be claimed by a secondary institution if a subcontract is included in the budget.**

This award does NOT provide funds (direct budget) for such items as:

- **Administration**
 - Administrative salaries not specifically related to the research project
 - Membership dues
- **Tuition, books, and fees**
 - Student tuition and fees (graduate or undergraduate), including books and periodicals
- **Office or laboratory setup and expenses**
 - Office and laboratory furniture
 - Office equipment and supplies
 - Rental of office or laboratory space
 - Construction, renovation, or maintenance of buildings or laboratories
- **Other**
 - Staff recruiting and relocation expenses
 - Non-medical services to patients (travel to a clinical site or patient incentives are allowable expenses)

Partner research grant funds may be used for computers for research purposes, which can be purchased with direct funds from the equipment budget.

16. OWNERSHIP OF EQUIPMENT

Equipment purchased under Partner research grants or grant extensions is for use by the principal investigator and collaborators. Title of such equipment shall be vested in the institution at which the principal investigator is conducting the research. These grants may not be transferred to another institution. The PI may negotiate the transfer of the equipment purchased with the grant funds to the new institution, and, if approved, title to such equipment shall be vested in the new institution.

17. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

As a not-for-profit organization supported by public contributions, the Partners wish to adopt policies and practices that enhance the likelihood that potentially beneficial discoveries and inventions will

be exploited to the benefit of humankind. It is the desire of the Partners that such inventions be administered in such a manner that they are brought into public use at the earliest possible time. The Partners recognize that often this may be best accomplished through patenting and/or licensing of such inventions. Accordingly, the Partners have adopted the following patent policy that is binding on all Grantees and not-for-profit Grantee Institutions (hereinafter "Grantee"), excluding postdoctoral fellowship Grantees at the National Institutes of Health and other government laboratories, for whom the applicable patent policies of the federal government shall apply. To the extent the Grantee Institution's own policies permit individual investigators to own any right, title or interest in any Funded Invention, the Grantee Institution shall ensure that each Investigator complies with the provisions of these terms and conditions with respect to such Funded Invention.

Acceptance of a Grant from the Partners constitutes acceptance of the terms and conditions of this policy. In the event of any conflict between this Policy and the Grantee's policy, the terms and conditions of this Policy shall govern.

- A. All notices required pursuant to this policy shall be in writing, and in this Policy, the following terms shall have the meaning set forth below.
 - i. "Invention" shall mean any potentially patentable discovery, material, method, process, product, program, software or use.
 - ii. "Funded Invention" shall mean any Invention made in the course of research funded in whole or in part by the Grant.
 - iii. "Yosemite – ACS Award" shall mean the total monetary amount of the Grant provided to the Grantee.
- B. The Grantee technology transfer officer shall provide the Partners with an annual report for each Funded Invention. The annual report will be due by January 31 of each calendar year after a Yosemite-ACS Grant Award has been received. The annual report shall include a listing or description of the following information for each Funded Invention: (1) all issued patents and pending patent applications, (2) all licenses, leases, or other revenue generating agreements, (3) all gross revenue for each preceding calendar year, (4) the filing, publication and issuance or grant of any application for a patent or other statutory right for a Funded Invention, and (5) the latest stage of development of any product arising from each Funded Invention.

Grantee shall pay all costs and expenses incident to all applications for patents or other statutory rights and all patents and other statutory rights that issue thereon owned by Grantee (other than patent filing fees as provided for in Section A).
- C. Both the Partners and Grantee, (the appropriate Grantee technology transfer officer managing Funded Invention), shall promptly inform the other of any suspected infringement of any patent covering a Funded Invention and of any misappropriation, misuse, theft or breach of confidence relating to other proprietary rights in a Funded Invention. Grantee and Partner will discuss in good faith further action to be taken in this regard.
- D. Grantee will license a Funded Invention in accordance with Grantee Policy and established practices.
- E. [Intentionally Omitted]
- F. Development and Commercialization of Funded Invention

The Partners wish to support and accelerate the commercialization and deployment of the results from Grantee's research. To help Grantee bring its Funded Invention to market as quickly as possible, Grantee shall inform the Partners if Grantee decides to commercialize or seek investment in any Funded Invention. The Grantee may, but shall be under no obligation

to, offer each Partner (but in no event, just one of the Partners) an opportunity to fund, facilitate, invest, or otherwise participate in such commercialization efforts.

Please note that the Partners are unable to renegotiate the terms of this agreement with any individual institution.

18. REQUESTS FOR GRANT MODIFICATIONS

All Forms can be found under the Deliverables tab at <https://proposalcentral.com/>. Please note that up-to-date annual reports are required prior to approval of any grant modifications including transfers and no-cost extensions. **The Partners reserve the right to deny requests for extensions or leaves of absence.**

- **Change of Term**

The PI may request to delay the start of their award by up to 6 months. The PI should contact the Program Office if a delay of term is needed prior to submitting the grant activation form.

- **No Cost Extension (NCE)**

A No-Cost Extension of up to 1-year may be requested by the grantee. The grantee should consult with their Program Office prior to submitting the NCE request form to discuss the most appropriate form to submit. Typically, the total dollar amount that is allowed to be carried over must be equal to or less than 1-year (or equivalent for the NCE term requested) of direct costs, plus 10% allowable indirect costs. The NCE form and estimate of funds to be carried over must be submitted in ProposalCentral at least 30 days before the end of the grant. The program office may also request a budget and justification for the NCE period. The grantee will be notified if the NCE is approved. NCEs requested after the grant's expiration date are not allowed.

- **Leave of absence**

Requests for a leave of absence will be handled on a case-by-case basis. If possible, please contact the Scientific Director at least 30 days prior to the proposed beginning of leave.

- **Key Personnel**

Contact your Scientific Director to request modifications to Key Personnel, such as co-investigators and collaborators.

- **Change of Institution**

Awards may not be transferred from one institution to another eligible institution. The PI will have to cancel the grant if they leave the awarded institution.

19. CANCELLATION OF GRANT

If a grant is to be canceled prior to the original termination date, contact your Scientific Director and submit the Request for Cancellation form found in the "Deliverables" section at <https://proposalcentral.com>. The Partners may cancel a grant at their collective discretion if the institution fails to comply with the terms and obligations related to the grant.

In the event a grant is canceled or transferred, the institution is only entitled to the prorated amount of the award accumulated between the start and termination dates. The Partners assume no responsibility for expenditures in excess of the prorated amount.

Follow Progress Reporting and Financial Reporting policies as described above.

APPENDIX A: GUIDELINES FOR MAINTAINING RESEARCH AND PEER REVIEW INTEGRITY

The Partners seek excellence in the discovery and dissemination of knowledge regarding the cause, prevention, detection, diagnosis, treatment, survivorship, and health policy of cancer. This requires that all individuals affiliated with, or funded by, the Partners adhere to the highest standards of professional integrity. Grant reviewers for the Partners will also be held to the highest codes of conduct and integrity in performing their essential function of peer review.

The Partners provide grant funds for individuals at academic and other not-for-profit institutions to promote cancer-related training, research, and treatment. This represents a contractual relationship with such institutions, and it is an accepted responsibility and obligation of those institutions to provide policies and procedures for their faculty, staff, and students that address possible misconduct in training, research, and treatment of patients. Moreover, it is the responsibility and obligation of faculty, students, and staff engaged in scientific research and training to be aware of policies and procedures for addressing possible misconduct at their institutions, and to follow those procedures in reporting possible misconduct.

While questions of the integrity of applicants, grantees, and reviewers are very infrequent, they do occur. Ensuring that all questions regarding research integrity are handled in a discrete, but thorough, manner is the responsibility of the Scientific Program Directors managing the review process and portfolios of funded grants, and, ultimately, the Partners.

The actions of the Partners and Scientific Directors must ensure:

- the confidentiality and anonymity of the individual raising the question of misconduct,
- the integrity of the Partners and their review processes,
- the rights of the individual accused of misconduct, and
- their own credibility and integrity.

Article I

Standards and Definitions:

1.1 Research Misconduct by Applicants or Grantees

The Partners use the following definitions related to scientific misconduct outlined in the Federal Guidelines [Federal Register, Vol. 65, No. 235, pg. 76260-76264].

- Research misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.¹
- Research, as used herein, includes all basic, applied, and demonstration research in all fields of science, engineering, and mathematics. This includes, but is not limited to, research in economics, education, linguistics, medicine, biology, chemistry, psychology, natural sciences, social sciences, and statistics, and all research involving human subjects or animals.¹
- Fabrication is defined as making up data or results and recording or reporting them.¹
- 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

The Partners have adopted the following definitions of misconduct by members of a Peer Review Committee. Misconduct in review is defined as:

- Review for an application for which there is a clear conflict of interest (COI) between the reviewer and applicant. Examples of a COI include joint work on a recent publication, collaboration on a grant, or having trained together.
- Failure to notify the Partner personnel of actual, potential, perceived, or potentially perceived conflicts of interest.
- Any communication pertaining to review-related materials between a reviewer and an applicant or applicant's mentor, when the application includes an element of training.
- Any communication of the unpublished content of a grant application by a reviewer with any individual who is not a permanent or ad hoc member of the peer review committee to which an application is assigned, or who has not been approved by the Scientific Director for such communication.
- Any use of the unpublished content or concepts of a grant application in pursuit of scientific or career goals by a reviewer.
- Any review or use of the contents of a grant application by a reviewer who might have, or might be perceived to have, a conflict of interest with the applicant or his/her mentor, when the application includes an element of training.

1.3 Confidentiality Standard for Reviewers

To preserve the integrity of the peer review process, all parties involved in the review process must adhere to the following practices regarding confidentiality and non-disclosure:

- All parties involved in the review process must sign and submit a confidentiality and non-disclosure agreement in advance of peer review.
- Reviewers must not discuss applications reviewed with any individual not designated as a part of the review process, and especially not with applicants or their mentors in the case of training grants, either before or after the peer review meetings.
- 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 Extramural Discovery Advisory Council must be reported immediately to the Scientific Director.

¹ The above definitions are outlined in the Federal Guidelines [Federal Register, Vol.65, No.235, pg.: 76260-76264]

- All materials related to the review process must be destroyed or given to the Research 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 for funding.
- Reviewers must not have any cause of action, dispute, or claim against, or any long-standing scientific or personal differences with, the applicant or any person listed as key personnel on an application.

Articles II

Policies:

2.1 Policy Governing Misconduct by Applicants and Grantees

2.1.1 Scientific Misconduct by Applicants:

Any allegations of scientific misconduct must be brought to the immediate attention of the Scientific Director in charge of the Peer Review Committee that is responsible for reviewing the work in question. If possible, allegations of scientific misconduct on the part of an applicant in the submission of a grant proposal should be raised in advance of the review meeting. The Scientific Director will then bring the allegation to the attention of the Partners. The Partners will 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 Partners. The Partners 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:

In instances where alleged professional misconduct occurs after the awarding of a grant, such as an allegation of sexual harassment by a principal investigator, the grantee should follow the reporting guidelines in Article III, section 3.1.3, “Procedure for Handling Allegations of Professional Misconduct by Grantees.”

2.2 Policy Governing Misconduct by Peer Review Committee Members

2.2.1 Confidentiality:

Confidentiality is at the heart of the peer review process and is imperative for objective evaluation and free expression in the review process. The applicant-reviewer relationship is a privileged alliance founded on the ethical rule of confidentiality. To maintain the essence and integrity of the peer review process, the Partners and their appointed peer reviewers must ensure and be assured that the confidentiality of the applicant’s information, the contents of the grant application, and the proceedings of the review panel will be maintained. Such confidentiality adheres when a person discloses information to another with the understanding that the information will not be divulged to others without the consent of the party who disclosed the information, or as otherwise required by law. In the context of peer review, this rule upholds the applicants’ rights to have the information they submit, whether in proposal form or in communications, kept confidential. The rule also ensures that those involved in the review process maintain their obligation to keep confidential any information concerning an application. In fact, the very existence of a submission should not be revealed (or confirmed), to anyone other than those within the review process unless and until the application is funded. To this end, all contents, evaluation and discussion of applications shall be confined to Peer Review Committee (PRC) members and Partner staff personnel (Scientific Director, Program staff), responsible for managing the review process of that PRC. For these purposes, reviewers include all standing, community research partner, and ad hoc reviewers of PRCs and members of the Extramural Discovery Science Advisory Board. In rare and specific instances, discussion of applications with, or in the presence of, non-committee members can occur after obtaining the written consent of the Scientific Director. Reviewers must not discuss reviews with applicants or their mentors in the case of training grants, either before or after the review meetings. Reviewers also must not communicate the contents of any grant applications with individuals not associated with the review process. Any materials related to the review process must be disposed of at the meeting, and all final critiques given to the Scientific Director.

If an allegation of a breach of reviewer confidentiality is brought forward, that allegation will be communicated to the Partners who will determine if an investigation of that allegation is warranted. The Senior Vice President for Extramural Discovery Science will then follow the appropriate steps as defined in Article III, section 3.2 “Procedure for Handling Reviewer Misconduct and Conflicts of Interest.”

2.2.2 Conflict of Interest:

An objective evaluation of grant proposals is essential to the peer review process. In achieving this goal, there must be no conflict of interest, apparent conflict of interest or pending future conflict of interest between any participant in the review process and the applicants or their collaborators and colleagues. In this setting, reviewers include standing, community research partner, and *ad hoc* Peer Review Committee (PRC) members and members of the Extramural Discovery Advisory Council and Partner personnel responsible for, and participating in, the review process. There are

numerous bases for conflicts of interest, and these can include: employment, professional relationships, personal relationships, financial benefit, industry affiliation or other interests. The conflicts can be real or perceived. For Definitions of Conflict of Interest, refer to Section 1.5.

Reviewers may not make use of any of the contents of a grant for their own research purposes or those of their collaborators and colleagues. Reviewers must exercise proper due diligence in investigating and disclosing any potential conflict of interest that might exist between themselves and an applicant or the applicant's collaborators or mentors. The Conflict of Interest Statement referenced below shall be submitted to the Partners prior to the beginning of Peer Review.

If an allegation of a reviewer conflict of interest is brought forward, that allegation will be communicated to the Partners who will determine if an investigation of that allegation is warranted. The Partners will then follow the appropriate steps as defined in Article III, section 3.2, "Procedure for Handling Reviewer Misconduct and Conflicts of Interest".

Reviewers and community research partners must submit electronically signed forms confirming compliance with required terms for confidentiality, conflict of interest, and relationship disclosure.

Article III

Procedures for Handling Conflicts of Interest and Allegations or Findings of Misconduct:

To ensure the integrity of the peer review process and the integrity of Yosemite-ACS-sponsored research, it is necessary that the procedures for dealing with allegations of misconduct be clearly understood by all reviewers and Yosemite and ACS personnel. Procedures for handling allegations of misconduct by applicants, grantees and reviewers are detailed in the following sections.

3.1 Procedures for Handling an Allegation of Scientific Misconduct by Applicants or Grantees

1.1.1 Procedure for Handling Allegations of Scientific Misconduct by Applicants:

In the event that an allegation of scientific misconduct by an applicant is brought forward to a Scientific Director or other Partner staff, all effort must be made to investigate the validity of the allegation while maintaining the confidentiality of the individual making the allegation, the anonymity of the person against whom the allegation is made, and the integrity of the review process. The Scientific Director must immediately inform the Partners of the allegation and provide all relevant information regarding the allegation. It is the Partners' responsibility to evaluate the likelihood of scientific misconduct; and, if warranted, it is the Partners' responsibility to contact the appropriate institutional office at the applicant's institution regarding the allegation. The Partner will then serve as the point of contact between the Partners and the institutional official[s] handling issues of scientific misconduct.

If determined to be appropriate, the Partners will forward an allegation of scientific misconduct and all pertinent information to the Research Integrity Officer at the institution sponsoring the grant application in question or at which the alleged scientific misconduct was carried out. If there is not a Research Integrity Officer, the Dean of the School in question or its chief academic officer will be contacted. In the instance that the person[s] making the allegation does not contact the Partners but raises the allegation of scientific misconduct with the appropriate institutional official according to their established institutional procedures, it is the responsibility of the institution to contact the Partners 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 Partners irrespective of the outcome of the investigation. The Partners assume 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 Partners, 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 Partners 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 Partners aware of the progress. 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 Partner staff raise the issue of the allegation in a peer review meeting. 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. If a reviewer suspects scientific misconduct, which is discovered at the time of the meeting, it is appropriate to request the Chair of the PRC or Council take a "break" and discuss the issue privately with the Scientific Director. The Scientific Director will then take the proscribed administrative steps following the adjournment of the review meeting.

The Partners will complete the process of peer review of the application but will suspend any administrative action which would result in funding of the award in question until the resolution of the investigation. At the conclusion of the investigation, the Partner will require the Office of Research Integrity or comparable entity at the applicant's sponsoring institution to provide a written statement detailing the results of the investigation including any actions taken, or actions pending. Failure of the institution to carry out such an investigation in a timely manner or to provide written results of the investigation will result in the administrative disapproval of the application. If the applicant is absolved of any scientific misconduct, the Partners will reinstitute administrative action that can result in funding for the award if it was approved and is within the fundable pay-line. In the instance that scientific misconduct has occurred, the Partners will administratively inactivate the application. Also, in the case of a finding of scientific misconduct, the investigator may no longer be eligible to participate in Partner funded awards, either as principal investigator, coinvestigator, collaborator, mentor, or consultant. The investigator also may not be eligible to serve in any capacity in reviewing Partner grant proposals.

3.1.2 Procedure for Handling Allegations of Scientific Misconduct by Grantees:

In the event that an allegation of scientific misconduct by a grantee is brought forward to a Scientific Director or other Partner staff, all effort must be made to investigate the validity of the allegation while maintaining the confidentiality of the individual making the allegation and the anonymity of the person against whom the allegation is made. The Scientific Director, or Partner staff contacted about the alleged scientific misconduct, must immediately inform a senior representative of the Partners of the allegation and provide all relevant information regarding the allegation. It is the Partners' responsibility to evaluate the likelihood of scientific misconduct; and, if warranted, it is the Partners' responsibility to contact the appropriate institutional office at the applicant's institution regarding the allegation. The Partners will serve as the point of contact between the Partners and the institutional official[s] handling issues of scientific misconduct.

If determined to be appropriate, the Partners will forward an allegation of scientific misconduct and all pertinent information to the Research Integrity Officer at the institution sponsoring the grant in question or at which the alleged scientific misconduct was carried out. If there is not a Research Integrity Officer, the Dean of the School in question or its chief academic officer will be contacted. In the instance that the person[s] making the allegation does not contact the Partners but raises the

allegation of scientific misconduct with the appropriate institutional official according to their established institutional procedures, it is the responsibility of the institution to contact the Partners 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 Partners irrespective of the outcome of the investigation. The Partners assume 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, failure of the institution to immediately notify the Partners of an allegation and/or investigation of scientific misconduct, or to carry out an investigation in a timely manner, or to provide written results to include findings, action taken, or any pending actions of the investigation, is in non-conformance with the terms and obligations of the grant and may result in the suspension of Partner funds for all grants awarded at the institution, to be decided by the Partners in its sole discretion. Acceptance or non-acceptance of the findings of the institutional investigation is at the discretion of the Partners, and additional clarification may be requested.

If the investigator has an active Yosemite-ACS Award, funding of that award will be suspended until the allegation has either been confirmed or be proven to be erroneous. If the allegation is proven not to have merit, the award may be reinstated by the Partners at the date of notification of those findings by the sponsoring institution. If the allegation of scientific misconduct is confirmed, the award will be terminated and any residual funds, as of the date of notification of the sponsoring institution of the allegation, must be returned to the Partners. In the case of a finding of scientific misconduct, the investigator may no longer be eligible to participate in Partner funded awards, either as principal investigator, co-investigator, collaborator, mentor, or consultant. The investigator may also not be eligible to serve in any capacity in reviewing Partner grant proposals.

The publication of data serves to further the interests of the scientific pursuit, and specifically in the case of the Partners, the pursuit of eliminating the burden of cancer. Therefore, it is incumbent on both the Partners and the scientific community to ensure that any instances of misrepresentation of findings in a scientific study are apparent to the scientific community. To that end, a finding of falsification or misrepresentation of data in a published forum must be reported to the editor-in-chief of the journal in which such data is reported. It is the responsibility of the Partners to coordinate such notification with the appropriate sponsoring institutional official according to their established policies and in conjunction with the policies of the journal. If the sponsoring institution does not have a policy regarding notification of the journal, then the Partners will notify the editor-in-chief of the journal according to the journal's established policies. In the case of findings of falsification or misrepresentation of published data supported by the Partners' funds, any active grant[s] held by the responsible individual will be terminated and that individual may no longer be eligible for Partner funding via any mechanism as a principal investigator, co-investigator, collaborator, mentor, or consultant. That individual may also not be eligible to participate in Partner review in any capacity.

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 the Partners (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 Partners 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:

- Yosemite-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 Partner of a finding of professional misconduct by a grantee, or (2) the institution notifies Partner that administrative action has been taken against a grantee because of a finding/determination that the grantee committed professional misconduct, Partner will consider the policy violation findings on a case-by-case basis. Partner 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 Partner. The grantee may no longer be eligible to participate in Partner 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 Partner grant proposals.

If the institution notifies the Partners of administrative action taken against a grantee pending an investigation of an allegation of professional misconduct and the investigator has an active Partner 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 the Partners at the date of notification of those findings by the sponsoring institution. If the allegation of professional misconduct is confirmed, the Partners will consider the policy violation findings on a case-by-case basis. If the award is terminated, any residual funds, as of the date of notification, must be returned to the Partners. In the case of a finding of professional misconduct, the grantee may no longer be eligible to participate in Partner 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 Partner grant proposals.

Institutions are strongly encouraged to conduct a thorough review of these guidelines to determine whether these guidelines necessitate any changes to the institution's policies and procedures. Institutions should likewise ensure that, in carrying out their investigating, disciplinary, and reporting obligations under these guidelines, they are at all times in compliance with state and federal laws, regulations, and guidelines applicable to the institution.

3.2 Procedure for Handling Reviewer Misconduct and Conflicts of Interest

In the event that an allegation of reviewer misconduct, such as failure to acknowledge a conflict of interest, is brought forward to a Scientific Director or other Partner staff, all effort must be made to investigate the validity of the allegation while maintaining the confidentiality of the individual making the allegation, the anonymity of the person against whom the allegation is made, and the integrity of the review process. The Scientific Director or other Partner staff contacted regarding the alleged misconduct must immediately inform a senior representative of the Partners of the allegation and provide all relevant information regarding the allegation. It is the senior representative of the Partners' responsibility to evaluate the likelihood of reviewer conflict of interest or misconduct; and, if warranted, it is the Partners' responsibility to handle the investigation internally or to inform the appropriate institutional office at the reviewer's institution about the allegation if aspects of the reviewer misconduct violate any of the tenets of professional behavior established by that institution. The Partners will serve as the point of contact with the institutional official handling issues of reviewer misconduct.

Some elements of reviewer misconduct represent conduct that will only have relevance for the appropriateness of the reviewer's role as a member of a peer review committee. For instance, if there is inappropriate communication between reviewer and applicant or an applicant's mentor or colleagues. In a case of this type, all elements of the investigation of the reviewer misconduct will be handled by Partner personnel. In cases where a reviewer does not retain the confidentiality of the applicant's information or the content of his or her application, and makes that information available to a third party, it will be at the discretion of the Partners to handle the issue internally or contact the Office of Research Integrity at the reviewer's institution, based upon an initial assessment of whether such conduct violates the rules of conduct established by that institution. For instance, if there is communication of the contents of a grant proposal by a reviewer to a competitor in the same field as the applicant, or if the reviewer makes use of findings or ideas in an application to further his or her own research interests. In the instance of such an allegation, the Partners assume no responsibility for carrying out the investigation of scientific misconduct, or in determining an individual's innocence or guilt of the allegation of misconduct. It is the institution's responsibility to handle the misconduct according to their established procedures, and to submit to the Partners a written report that includes findings, actions taken, and any pending actions.

However, acceptance or non-acceptance of the findings of the institutional investigation is at the discretion of the Partners, and additional clarification may be requested. In any instance of a finding of reviewer misconduct, that individual may no longer be eligible to serve in any capacity in reviewing Partner grant proposals and may be barred from receiving any Partner grant funds.

References:

The American Cancer Society Confidentiality, Non-Disclosure Rules and Conflict of Interest: Information for Reviewers of Grant Applications, Version 10/2024.

“Confidentiality in Peer Review” (section 3.7.1). Pugh MB, ed. American Medical Association Manual of Style: a guide for authors and editors. 9th ed. Baltimore, MD: Williams & Wilkins; 1997:136-137.

Federal Register, Vol. 65, No. 235, pg. 76260-76264.

APPENDIX B: INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING DELIVERABLES

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

The Altum ProposalCentral **Post Award Management System** shall be used to facilitate management of the Yosemite-ACS Award. 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 Partner staff and grantees. Grantees may provide access to others at their institution (e.g., grants officers) using the instructions provided below.

All awardees of a Yosemite-ACS Award will need to upload deliverables to ProposalCentral. The first deliverable we collect 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 them 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 of the Yosemite-ACS Award , 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
- Click the “Send Email” button to send the email(s) to the selected administrator

Once an application is awarded it moves from ProposalCentral into the Post Award Management System. People who previously had access to your application in ProposalCentral will not have access to your awarded grant in the Post Award Management System. You may need to allow access to different users than those listed in ProposalCentral to enable them to upload various reports on your behalf.

To grant another user access to your award and submit deliverables

- Person(s) must be a registered user on ProposalCentral. If they are not, ask them to register as a new user at: <https://proposalcentral.com/>
- Once user is registered, from Award Detail screen click “Contacts” and “User Access” link
- Click on “Manage User Access to Award” at the top of the screen
- Enter and confirm email address of person
- Click on “Add” button
- Change the Permissions role from View to Administrator
- Click on “Save” button to activate access for new person

To upload other documents/deliverables such as publications, CV, ad hoc IP reports, etc.

- Click the "Add Deliverable" link on the Award Deliverable screen. Select "Other" from the drop-down menu next to "Deliverable Type" from the pop-up screen
- Type in the "Deliverable Description" (i.e., Publications; CV; etc.)
- Click "Browse" to upload their document
- Click "Save"

Additional information and help can be obtained through ProposalCentral customer support desk:

By phone: 1-800-875-2562 toll free

By email: pcsupport@altum.com