## Schedule at a Glance (All morning sessions will be held in 133 CNB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MON</th>
<th>Tuesday, June 14</th>
<th>Wednesday, June 15</th>
<th>Thursday, June 16</th>
<th>Friday, June 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:50 | Welcome and Introduction  
Ann Marie McCarthy, Professor and Associate Dean for Research, UI CON | Group 1 Critiques: Teams of 2 reviewers each assigned to a grant writer in **Group 1** will present their reviews of the proposal component chosen by the grant writer (~24 min per review team). | Group 1 Critiques: Teams of 2 reviewers each assigned to a grant writer in **Group 2** will present their reviews of the proposal component chosen by the grant writer (~24 min per review team). | Writing for Impact  
Richard Hichwa, UI Senior Associate Vice President for Research and Professor, Physics and Astronomy |
| 9:00 | Conceptual Frameworks  
Cornelia Beck, Professor, Co-Director of the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences  
Hartford Center for Geriatric Nursing Excellence | **No sessions** | **No sessions** | **No sessions** |
| 10:00 | Submitting Grants to AHRQ  
Mary Blegen, Adjunct Professor, College of Nursing, University of Colorado at Denver, and Professor Emerita, Dept. of Community Health Systems, UC San Francisco | **No sessions** | **No sessions** | **No sessions** |
| 11–11:30 | Break | Break | Break | **No Small Groups scheduled**  
Continue working on your own. |
| 11:30 | NIH Early Career Reviewer Program  
Sue Gardner, Professor, CON | Preliminary Data  
Stephan Arndt, Professor, Department of Psychiatry, Director, Iowa Consortium for Substance Abuse Research | Addressing the New NIH Rigor and Transparency Criteria  
Kristine Williams, Professor, CON and Director, Csomay Center for Gerontological Excellence | Concluding remarks and graduation |
| 12:30–1:30 | Lunch – 4th Floor Faculty/Staff Lounge (431 CNB) | **No Small Groups scheduled**  
Continue working on your own. | **No Small Groups scheduled**  
Continue working on your own. | **No Small Groups scheduled**  
Continue working on your own. |
| 1:30–4:00 | Small group meetings (see Page 3 for rosters and room assignments) | **No Small Groups scheduled**  
Continue working on your own. | **No Small Groups scheduled**  
Continue working on your own. | **No Small Groups scheduled**  
Continue working on your own. |

***Copies of workshop materials will be made available at Shared L:\ResearchForum\2016 Grantsmanship Workshop***
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Workshop Attendees

**Small group leaders**
- Kitty Buckwalter
- Kathy Clark
- Martha Craft-Rosenberg
- Keela Herr
- Ann Marie McCarthy
- Toni Tripp-Reimer
- Janet Williams
- Kristine Williams

**Invited speakers**
- Stephan Arndt
- Cornelia Beck
- Mary Blegen
- Sue Gardner
- Richard Hichwa
- Ann Marie McCarthy
- Toni Tripp-Reimer
- Janet Williams
- Kristine Williams

**Grant writers**
- Jacinda Bunch
- Catherine Cherwin
- Amany Farag
- Ruth Grossmann
- Patricia Groves
- Katherine Hadlandsmyth
- Cynthia LaFond
- Wen Liu
- Barbara St. Marie
- Lisa Segre (with Maya Jordan)
- Marianne Smith
- Janette Taylor

**Other registered attendees**
- Melissa Lehan-Mackin
- Lin Pierce
- April Prunty
Small Group Assignments (1 PM – 4 PM, Tuesday June 14 - Thursday June 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A Leaders:</th>
<th>Group B Leaders:</th>
<th>Group C Leaders</th>
<th>Group D Leaders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Marie McCarthy</td>
<td>Janet Williams</td>
<td>Keela Herr</td>
<td>Toni Tripp-Reimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty Craft-Rosenberg</td>
<td>Kathy Clark</td>
<td>Kitty Buckwalter</td>
<td>Kristine Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 437</td>
<td>Room 230 CNB</td>
<td>Room 435 (Morris Lab)</td>
<td>Room 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Hadlandsmyth</td>
<td>Catherine Cherwin</td>
<td>Jacinda Bunch</td>
<td>Amany Farag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia LaFond</td>
<td>Ruth Grossmann</td>
<td>Marianne Smith</td>
<td>Patricia Groves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara St. Marie</td>
<td>Wen Liu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Segre and Maya Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SROP student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Janette Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentative proposal titles, projected funding mechanisms and brief descriptions provided by grant writers

**Jacinda Bunch, *TBD***
- Funding mechanism: TBD
- Brief description: TBD

**Catherine Cherwin, “Gastrointestinal Symptom Clusters and Changes in GI Microbiome in Solid Tumor Patients Receiving Chemotherapy”**
- Funding mechanism: Oncology Nursing Society (ONS), American Cancer Society grants through HCCC (both due in the fall)
- Brief description: To look at GI symptoms, symptom clusters, and microbiome changes of patients with a solid tumor receiving chemotherapy. Sample will consist of chemo naive patients and will follow them through first three months (?) of treatment. I plan on collecting stool samples and symptoms before chemo begins and during each cycle of chemotherapy. I will look at changes in the GI microbiome and changes of symptoms with a focus on GI symptoms.

**Ruth Grossmann, “Evaluating the impact of supplements/fortification on the microbiome, metabolome and mitochondrial function.”**
- Funding mechanism: NIH or AHRQ
- Brief description: Feeding study of a standard American diet getting nutrients from processed foods vs a non-processed food diet. / Evaluation of bioavailability of nutrients from deuterium labeled collards vs supplements and the impact on the microbiome, metabolome and mitochondrial function

**Patricia Groves, “Safety Simulation.”**
- Funding mechanism: NIH or AHRQ
- Brief description: Full scale version of the CON RFP simulation safety study.
Katherine Hadlandsmyth, “Identifying and Intervening with Veterans at Risk for Developing Persistent Post-TKA Pain.”
Funding mechanism: Other (not specified)
Brief description: The research objective of my CDA-2 application is to identify individual predictors of risk for poor outcomes following TKA and to investigate the feasibility of providing a telehealth Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) intervention for those identified to be at risk. The long term goal is to facilitate my development to an independent VA investigator through training in: secondary use of large VA medical record data sets, statistical modeling to predict individual risk, and conducting feasibility studies, including qualitative analyses and use of tele-medicine.

Cynthia LaFond, TBD
Funding mechanism: Mayday Fund
Brief description: Grant for a national or international PICU pain point prevalence study.

Wen Liu, “Mealtime Assistance and Response among Nursing Home Staff and Cognitively Impaired Residents.”
Funding mechanism: UI Internal award (e.g., Vice President for Research Major Project Grant, Prevention Research Center, etc.)
Brief description: Background: Cognitively impaired residents require great mealtime assistance. Appropriate and effective staff mealtime assistance is essential to successfully engage residents in eating tasks for the purpose of optimizing eating performance and food intake. / Purpose: The purposes of the study are: 1) to describe the frequency and types of staff mealtime assistance provided as well as resident subsequent responses to assistance, 2) to describe the person-centeredness of staff assistance, 3) to examine the association of staff mealtime assistance with person-centeredness, and 4) to examine association of staff assistance with resident subsequent response to assistance and food intake among nursing home staff-resident dyads. Methods: This study will be a secondary analysis of 39 baseline video recordings of eating activities among xx nursing assistants and xx residents with dementia in xx nursing homes from a RCT study testing a communication intervention. Video recordings will be coded using a Mealtime Assistance-Response Interaction Checklist to collect data including type of staff assistance (verbal, visual, partial physical, full physical), person-centeredness of staff assistance (person-centered, task-centered), type of resident response to assistance (not observed, negative response, positive response), and whether there is a successful bite of food or drink of liquid by each assistance-response cycle. Definitions and examples of each code will be provided. Descriptive statistics will be used to describe nursing staff and resident characteristics. Chi-square test will be used to examine unadjusted association, and logistic regression for adjusted association controlling for potential covariates including resident (e.g., age, gender, cognitive function/dementia severity), staff (e.g., working experience) and facility (e.g., nursing home site ID) characteristics.

Barbara St. Marie, “Decision Support for Responsible Pain Management.”
Funding mechanism: NIH or AHRQ or an SBIR
Brief description: My K23 has already been submitted. I’m thinking the timing may be right for responding to the reviewers. If not, I will remain open to helping others. If the K23 does not go through I will need to resubmit or pull together an SBIR Grant.
Lisa Segre, “Pilot test of Listening Visits with newly diagnosed cancer patients.”
Funding mechanism: TBD (foundation or internal grant)
Brief description: Goal is to write a grant to provide help for those newly diagnosed cancer patients who are identified as being depressed during screening by the oncology unit.

Marianne Smith, “Family Involvement in Care (FIC)”
Funding mechanism: Jo Hoyt Freeman Dementia Education and Outreach Fund
Brief description: The Family Involvement in Care (FIC) intervention refers to a strategy that partners family caregiver(s) and long-term care facility staff to provide the best possible care for a person with dementia. One key to the FIC intervention is for both parties to continually negotiate and clarify their expectations to establish mutually satisfactory roles and relationships. Another key is for staff to help family members choose the type and frequency of activities in which they want to participate.

Janette Taylor, “Enhancing Community - Based Services for Black Women Victims of Partner Violence.”
Funding mechanism: NIH or AHRQ
Brief description: Our comparative effectiveness study will evaluate two approaches to improving psychosocial health outcomes for rural African American women who are victim-survivors of intimate partner violence (IPV). A multimodal intervention, Music and Account-Making Behavioral-Related Adaption (MAMBRA), will be the primary intervention of interest. This program includes screening for IPV and psychological symptoms of distress, group psychoeducation and strategies for symptom management. Additionally, trained advocates will work 1:1 with women to help create and access/utilize community resources to reduce their risk of further violence and enhance/promote violence free living. We will compare its effectiveness, acceptance, and usage to usual care of individual counseling which has a long established tradition of being used for such victim-survivors. Similarly, trained advocates will work 1:1 with women to help create and access/utilize community resources to reduce their risk of further violence and enhance/promote violence free living.

Links to Grant Writing Resources at NIH:

NIH Policy: Enhancing Reproducibility through Rigor and Transparency training modules (1-4)
http://www.nih.gov/research-training/rigor-reproducibility/training
The NIH Grants Process: the Big Picture: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rNwsg_PR90w&feature=youtu.be
NIH Peer Review Experts Webinars: www.csr.nih.gov/webinar (4 different videos available)
NIH Peer Review Revealed: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fBDxI6l4dOA&feature=youtu.be (14:51)
NIH Tips for Applicants: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lAOGtr0pM6Q
Link to the NIH Online Grantsmanship Workshop Modules:
http://www.ninr.nih.gov/training/grantsmanship#.U1fh4xDt83A
Reviewer Assignments

During the workshop, grant writers will have the opportunity to choose a section of their proposal and have it reviewed in the morning session by two other grant writers attending the workshop on either Tuesday, June 15 or Wednesday, June 16 (see reviewer assignments below). **Grant writers should email the proposal section to their two reviewers by 6 PM the day before the review will be presented** (i.e., by 6 PM on Tuesday, June 14 for those being reviewed on Day 1; by 6 PM on Wednesday, June 15 for those being reviewed on Day 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1 (Wednesday, June 15) - Info due to reviewers by 6 PM on 6/14</th>
<th>Day 2 (Thursday, June 16) - Info due to reviewers by 6 PM on 6/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being Reviewed - Group 1</td>
<td>Reviewer 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacinda Bunch</td>
<td>Wen Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Cherwin</td>
<td>Barbara St. Marie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Grossmann</td>
<td>Lisa Segre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Groves</td>
<td>Marianne Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Hadlandsmyth</td>
<td>Janette Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia LaFond</td>
<td>Jacinda Bunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestions for What to ask Your Reviewers to Review

Here are a few ideas for what you might ask your reviewers to review:

1. **Your 1-page Specific Aims**: This page should be succinct, logically developed, and convincing, with brief explicit rationale for innovativeness, significance, and potential for high impact if the aims are met successfully. After reading your Specific Aims page, your reviewers should be able to answer this question: How will results move the science forward?

2. **Provide an individual section of your proposal and ask your reviewers to evaluate it based on the NIH criteria for that section:**
   - **Significance**:
     - Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field?
     - Is there a strong scientific premise for the project? Have the investigators considered the strengths and weaknesses of published research or preliminary data crucial to the support of their application?
     - If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice in one or more broad fields be improved?
     - How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?
o **Innovation:**
  - Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms?
  - Does the application develop or utilize novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Do these have any advantage over existing methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions?
  - Does the application propose a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions?

o **Approach:**
  - Is it clear where the PI’s Preliminary Data appear in the proposal? (e.g., under Significance or under Approach or both)
  - Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses to be used well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project?
  - Have the investigators described an experimental design and proposed methods to ensure they will achieve robust and unbiased results, including describing how data will be collected, analyzed, and interpreted?
  - Have the investigators described potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success that are anticipated to achieve the aims?
  - If the project is in the early stages of development, have the investigators described a strategy to establish feasibility and addressed how high risk aspects of the proposed work be managed?
  - Have the investigators presented adequate explanation for how relevant biological variables, such as sex, are factored into research designs and analyses for studies in vertebrate animals or human subjects? For example, investigators who propose to study only one sex should provide strong justification from the scientific literature, preliminary data, or other relevant considerations.
  - If the proposal involves human subjects, are the plans for 1) protection of human subjects from research risks, and 2) inclusion of minorities and members of both sexes/genders, as well as the inclusion of children, justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed? Are the proposed proportions of individuals (such as males and females) in the sample justified? This information can be expanded in the Human Subjects sections, but must be addressed in Approach as well.
  - Have the investigators pointed out any procedures, situations, or materials that may be hazardous to personnel and precautions to be exercised?
Investigators: Provide your reviewers with the biosketches of your proposed team members and ask them to judge the following:

- Are the PD/PI, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project?
- Do the investigators have appropriate experience and training?
- If the project is collaborative in nature, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise?
- Are the leadership approach, governance, and organizational structure appropriate for the project?

3. **Ask your reviewers to review your completed Approach Summary Table** (a template is on Page 9 of this document). It is critical that your Specific Aims match your Approach and completing an Approach Summary table is a good exercise for ensuring that your Specific Aims and Approach match and are consistent. After seeing your Approach Summary Table, reviewers should have a clear idea of the following:

- For each aim, the design, recruitment plan, and outcome variables for which data will be collected.
- For each aim, the data collection and analysis procedures.

4. Any other section or aspect of your proposal not covered in the examples above. **Please make sure to share with your reviewers the sponsor’s criteria for the funding mechanism to which you are applying.**
You may copy and paste the following table into a blank MS Word document or you may prefer just to write out a description of the following:

5. For each aim, specify the design, recruitment plan, and outcome variables for which data will be collected.
6. For each aim, describe the data collection and analysis procedures.
7. Make sure you include somewhere how and where you plan to present any Preliminary Data in your proposal (e.g., under Significance, Approach, or both).

Notes: You may have fewer than four Aims. Do not include minute details about instruments, specific information about interventions, etc. Rather, focus on making sure that each one of your Specific Aims can be linked to a set of methods and analyses. Remember that each aim must be backed up by a way to collect the data and a plan for analyzing the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Variables/Outcome measure(s)</th>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>How this will be collected: method, instrument, interview, items on a tool</td>
<td>When will this be collected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From whom will data be collected? (i.e., sample, inclusion/exclusion criteria)</td>
<td>Characteristics of data that will be entered (frequency, %, counts, etc.)</td>
<td>Proposed data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific Aim 1

Specific Aim 2

Specific Aim 3

Specific Aim 4
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