

Changes in Policies or Procedures

[What is the 2012 New MEG Support Model and why have you made this change?](#)

The current MEG process is based on a system of continuing education that is in the midst of change. Accrediting and licensing bodies are moving away from a time-based credit system to a performance improvement-based system for board certification and licensure of healthcare professionals. The model of the future is that of practice change and competency, and traditional CE/CME activities will not likely be sufficient for this level of improvement to occur or to be sustained.

The Pfizer Medical Education Group fundamentally believes that adopting a new model is in the best interest of patients, healthcare professionals, health systems and Pfizer. This new model makes a strategic distinction between

1. those clinical areas where the translation of knowledge into practice is paramount to closing practice gaps and improving patient care, and
2. those where knowledge exchange around emerging science and discoveries is necessary and foundational.

Additionally, current financial constraints speak to the need for a new efficient, more effective model that allows Pfizer to make a stronger, more positive impact on the lives of patients and the healthcare system today, with less resources.

[What are the main differences between Track 1 and Track 2?](#)

Track 1 – Healthcare Quality Improvement & Education:

Process includes the publishing of evidence-based, data driven Request for Proposals (RFPs) in key clinical areas where gaps have been identified through external entities (government agencies like NIH and CDC, academia, Medicare/Medicaid data), registries and other assessment methodologies and processes (needs assessments, gap analyses, quality indicators, etc.). Each RFP will focus on areas (clinical, geographical, methodological) where Pfizer support could potentially have the greatest impact on improved patient care and outcomes.

Based on models utilized by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJ), the new Pfizer MEG model will allow for a collaborative dialog between the Pfizer Medical Education Group and healthcare organizations regarding evidence-based need, practice gaps and innovative strategies and methodologies to help close those gaps.

Borrowing from our current model, Pfizer MEG will continue to acknowledge and embrace the value and importance of independence with respect to the content of any initiative it supports. Additionally, the implementation of External Review Panels will provide additional assurances that all proposals supported are based on sound, externally-validated evidence, and include appropriate methodologies and assessments designed to align with the clinical problems needing to be solved.

Track 2 – Annual Meetings (Emerging Science/Knowledge Exchange):

Pfizer MEG will establish a mechanism whereby accredited providers of education can request funding to support LIVE activities at national conferences and congresses, recognizing the important, but limited role this type of medical education plays in

disseminating new information. Clinical areas of interest and goals (based on needs data) will be published similar to the current MEG model. Eligible providers will submit a funding request through the online MEG portal. Grant thresholds will be established based on conference size/scope, the number of grant requests received by a single organization, and overall grant volume will be limited in order to manage scope with reduced resources.

Ongoing Initiatives: There will be initiatives that fall out of scope for Track 1 or Track 2, including projects that MEG has supported prior to January 1, 2012 that require ongoing oversight through completion of the project. Additionally, Pfizer supports medical education through its various alliance activities where the review process and requirements are negotiated between the two companies. Lastly, as REMS (Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies) requirements evolve and include CME as a component, MEG will provide oversight, review and decision-making for all grants associated with REMS.

[Will there be dollar limits for each of the two application types?](#)

Track 1- Healthcare Quality Improvement and Education

This information will be outlined in RFP postings.

Track 2-Annual Meetings

For Annual Meetings submissions, the general guideline regarding funding caps are as follows:

Regional Meeting	\$25,000
National Meeting	\$50,000

Under limited circumstances there may be exceptions.

[In what ways does this new model enable greater transparency?](#)

The new model certainly enables greater transparency. All final-funded grants, all milestone reports and all outcomes from funded initiatives will be posted to our external-facing website under the Resource Center. In regards to transparency for Track 2: all grants-funded through this track will be also continue to be posted on our external-facing website through our Transparency in Grants initiative as they are under our current model.

Registration

[What are the system registration requirements?](#)

All applicants seeking funding for grant support will still be required to register prior to submitting a grant request. A basic review of the submitted profile will be completed. Organizations who meet the basic requirements will then be approved to submit grant applications. Please note only applicants who have been informed of an approval of their registration, will be able to submit grants requests.

Please note the following changes to our registration criteria:

If your organization is already registered in our system, you will not be required to re-register. Your registration will stay active in the system and you can proceed to use the system as normal.

If your organization is not registered in our system, the registration process has been simplified to require basic organizational information and going forward new registrants no longer are required to go through your CME/CPD departments to register.

Also note that if your program will be offering credits, then the accredited organization will still be the organization required to complete the registration and grant application.

Pfizer's policy regarding the elimination of all direct funding for CME/CE programs by commercial providers remains in effect. Medical Education and Communication Companies (MECCS) are not eligible to register and should continue to partner with registered eligible organizations on collaborative projects.

Application

[When are the application deadlines?](#)

Track 1 – Healthcare Quality Improvement and Education

Submission timelines will be included in the posting of all Requests for Proposal (RFPs). Please check back to our website as we hope to release the first RFPs in late March/early April 2012.

Track 2 – Annual Meetings

In order to submit a request through Track 2 the answer to the following questions must be “Yes”:

- Does the activity align with Pfizer’s posted areas of interest? (see Clinical Areas Tab on www.pfizermededgrants.com)
- Is it a live periodic (e.g. annual) activity which serves as a platform for the exchange of new clinical and scientific information and reaches a national or regional audience?
- Is this activity developed by your organization specifically for your professional members or constituents?
- Is the activity established part of your organization’s ongoing educational program? If not, if it is a new activity, is it clearly based on an assessment of the educational needs of your target audience?

There will be 5 submission cycles. Please see grid below:

Submission Cycle	<i>To Submit Live Activity Must Start On or After</i>	Decision Communicated By*
Jan 1 - Feb 15	Apr 1	Mar 9
Mar 1 - Apr 15	Jun 1	May 4
May 1 - June 15	Aug 1	July 6
July 1 - Aug 15	Oct 1	Sept 7
Sept 1 - Oct 15	Dec 1	Nov 2
<i>*If approved, LOA must be accepted before start date of activity</i>		

[In which clinical areas of interest will Pfizer accept grant requests?](#)

Track 1- Healthcare Quality Improvement and Education

This information will be outlined in RFP postings.

Track 2 – Annual Meetings

For information regarding the latest on clinical areas of interest, please see the posted list on www.pfizermededgrants.com under the Resource Section on the Clinical Areas Tab.

Registered users of our Grant Management System can also view this information by logging in to the system and viewing the file that is posted to your homepage.

Additional information about Track 1: Healthcare Quality Improvement and Education

[How does this new model differ from the current MEG model?](#)

MEG will continue to focus its efforts on transparency, responsibility and the interests of the public through support of medical education and quality improvement initiatives. The primary difference is a shift from an unsolicited process (with few CGAs – Calls for Grants), to an RFP-driven process that enables Pfizer MEG to be more focused on areas of interest with the greatest need for quality improvement.

The new model allows Pfizer MEG experts to engage in a collaborative dialog with organizations wishing to submit a proposal for consideration. Serving as liaisons between External Review Panels and the external community. The External Review Panels are important components of the new model, since their addition will allow for the collaborative dialog described above. Ultimately, the merits and integrity of any proposal will be based on the strength of the proposal and the power of the data it is based upon. and the final decision to approve or deny will be made by the External Review Panel.

Members of the External Review Panels will consist of professionals from the medical and education communities with advanced degrees and expertise in a particular clinical area, or specific needs of a geographic region/learner groups, or expertise in CME, CE, Continuing Professional Development (CPD) or Quality Improvement. All members will have published previous works and/or proven accomplishments. Pfizer will establish a vetting process that resolves all conflicts of interest prior to engaging committee members. All appropriate legal and regulatory processes will be implemented to ensure members are acting in the best interest of patients when reviewing and approving proposals; in compliance with all internal and external policies.

[Why are you devoting such a large percentage of the budget to the RFP model?](#)

We found that in the past our highest quality grant requests were generated in response to our calls for grant applications. We hope this streamlines efficiency for educational providers by proactively identifying funding opportunities, and streamlines our time for reviewing higher quality grant requests.

How will RFPs be disseminated? Will they be posted publically?

RFPs will be posted on our external-facing website. In addition, they will also be disseminated through e-mail to all registered organizations. We expect to release 2-3 per clinical area per year. At this time, we do not plan to publish a schedule for the release of RFPs.

Who can request grant support in response to a RFP?

Any registered, qualified organization can request grant support in response to a RFP.

How will providers know what to submit in their letters of intent (LOI)? Will there be a template?

This new process will be much more prescribed than our previous calls for grant applications. Pfizer MEG intends to specify public health concerns that align with clinical interests, and present a body of evidence that substantiates knowledge and performance gaps amongst health care professionals, for which education is likely to improve patient care.

A Letter of Intent template will be provided with each published RFP.

What will be the timing of the release of the RFPs, deadlines, decisions, program start and end date timeframes?

At this time we are establishing timeline requirements, please visit back soon for further announcements. We hope to post the first 2-3 RFPs in late March/early April. Once posted RFPs themselves will include all relevant deadlines.

Who will sit on the review panels? How are these reviewers determined? Are they paid consultants or volunteers?

The External Review Panel will be health care professionals, educationalists and public health experts. Once finalized, we will post the process we will use to select the External Review Panel on our external facing website (www.pfizermededgrants.com). All review panel members will be paid an honorarium based on fair market value for their time and expertise.

What is MEG's role in the review process?

Based on models utilized by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJ), the new Pfizer model will allow for a collaborative dialog between MEG (which employs experts in medical education, adult learning, performance and quality improvement) and health care organizations regarding evidence-based need, practice gaps and innovative strategies and methodologies to help close those gaps.

Borrowing from our current model, MEG will continue to acknowledge and embrace the value and importance of independence with respect to the content of any initiative it supports. Additionally, the implementation of an External Review Panel will provide additional assurances that all proposals supported are based on sound, externally-validated evidence, and include appropriate methodologies and assessments designed to align with the clinical problems needing to be solved.

[I have an idea of what to submit for a posted RFP, is there someone I can speak with to develop the idea?](#)

Yes, please send an e-mail to Mededgrants@pfizer.com with your idea and contact information and a MEG colleague will be in contact.

Also, please see below for aligned Educational Directors by Clinical Area:

Clinical Area	Contact
Infectious Disease – Bacterial	Susan Connelly (484) 865-9885
Lung Cancer	Jackie Mayhew (212) 733-7254
Pain	Bob Kristofco (212) 733-0055
Inflammation	Bob Kristofco (212) 733-0055
Smoking Cessation	Jackie Mayhew (212) 733-7254
Vaccines	Susan Connelly (484) 865-9885
Women's Health	Bob Kristofco (212) 733-0055

[If MEG accepts my Letter of Intent \(LOI\), does that mean my request is approved?](#)

No. The new RFP model is a two stage process: Stage 1: LOI Submission; Stage 2: Full Grant Proposal. If your LOI is approved, you are invited then to submit your full program proposal.

[For each RFP, will the goal be to fund one program or several appropriate programs?](#)

How many proposals we are able to support will depend on the budget available, and the decision made by our External Review Panel.

[Will publication of outcomes be an important part of the grant process?](#)

It is our expectation that outcomes of any supported initiative will be made available to the general public, either through publication, or posting on the Pfizer MEG website.

Additional Information about Track 2: Annual Meetings

[What types of live activities are supported in Track 2?](#)

Track 2 accepts requests for funding of live (face-to-face) annual major congresses/conferences that focus on Emerging Science/Knowledge Exchange and have a national or regional reach. Clinical areas of interest and goals (based on needs data) are posted on the MEG website in the Resource Center under the Clinical Areas tab.

[Why have you restricted funding to certain types of live activities?](#)

Due to reduced resources the overall grant volume had to be limited in order to manage this review.

What is **not** supported in Track 2?

Examples of live activities that are **not** supported in Track 2 include activities as part of a Regularly Scheduled Series (e.g. Grand Rounds, Journal Clubs), one-off educational activities, independent satellite symposia, recorded webcasts of live meeting, post meeting recaps, online programs and enduring materials.

What if a performance improvement initiative from Track 1 includes a component that would otherwise fit within Track 2? Which track will the grant request be channeled towards?

The request should be submitted via Track 1 as long as it is in response to an already posted RFP.

Can I submit multiple requests for the same annual meeting?

Only one request per annual meeting will be accepted. Please do not submit multiple requests as they will be denied and you will be asked to resubmit one request.

Can my organization respond to a RFP in Track 1 and also submit for funding of my live activity in Track 2?

Yes. Submitting a request in one track does not preclude you from submitting a different request in the other Track. Please note, you should never submit the same request under both tracks.

Are there any restrictions on how much funding Pfizer will provide?

Grant thresholds will be established based on factors including but not limited to conference size/scope and the number of grant requests received by a single organization, and overall grant volume will be limited in order to manage scope with reduced resources.

Will these grant requests be reviewed on a competitive basis?

Each request will be evaluated based on a standard set of criteria. Approval decisions will be made based on quality without regard to the rating of other requests. However, available budget will always play a role in the decision process.

