The University of Iowa College of Nursing  
Office for Nursing Research and Scholarship  
SUMMER GRANTSMANSHIP WORKSHOP  
June 14 - 17, 2016  

Updated 6/14/2016  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome and Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Marie McCarthy, Professor and Associate Dean for Research, UI CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual Frameworks</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>Writing for Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornelia Beck, Professor, Co-Director of the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences Hartford Center for Geriatric Nursing Excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Hichwa, UI Senior Associate Vice President for Research and Professor, Physics and Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitting Grants to AHRQ</td>
<td>No sessions</td>
<td>Being Responsive to Institute/Organization Strategic Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Blegen, Adjunct Professor, College of Nursing, University of Colorado at Denver, and Professor Emerita, Dept. of Community Health Systems, UC San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td>Janet Williams, Professor, CON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–11:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>mentored discussion on NIH Mechanisms and Paylines Data: What do you want to know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>NIH Early Career Reviewer Program</td>
<td>Preliminary Data</td>
<td>Addressing the New NIH Rigor and Transparency Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sue Gardner, Professor, CON</td>
<td>Stephan Arndt, Professor, Department of Psychiatry, Director, Iowa Consortium for Substance Abuse Research</td>
<td>Kristine Williams, Professor, CON and Director, Csomay Center for Gerontological Excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30–1:30</td>
<td>Lunch – 4th Floor Faculty/Staff Lounge (431 CNB)</td>
<td>Lunch – 4th Floor Faculty/Staff Lounge (431 CNB)</td>
<td>Lunch – 4th Floor Faculty/Staff Lounge (431 CNB)</td>
<td>Lunch – 4th Floor Faculty/Staff Lounge (431 CNB)</td>
<td>No Small Groups scheduled – Continue working on your own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30–4:00</td>
<td>Small group meetings (see Page 3 for rosters and room assignments)</td>
<td>Small group meetings (see Page 3 for rosters and room assignments)</td>
<td>Small group meetings (see Page 3 for rosters and room assignments)</td>
<td>Small group meetings (see Page 3 for rosters and room assignments)</td>
<td>Small group meetings (see Page 3 for rosters and room assignments)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Copies of workshop materials will be made available at Shared L:\ResearchForum\2016 Grantsmanship Workshop***
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)  
with Tentative Proposal Titles and Potential Funding Mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A Leaders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Marie McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty Craft-Rosenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group B Leaders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janet Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 230 CNB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group C Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keela Herr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty Buckwalter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 435 (Morris Lab)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group D Leaders:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toni Tripp-Reimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Katherine Hadlandsmyth  
Cynthia LaFond  
Barbara St. Marie  

Catherine Cherwin  
Ruth Grossmann  
Wen Liu  

Jacinda Bunch  
Marianne Smith  

Aman Farag (attending only)  
Patricia Groves  
Lisa Segre and Maya Jordan  
(SROP student)  
Janette Taylor

---

**Group A**  
**Room 437 CNB**  

Katherine Hadlandsmyth, “Identifying and Intervening with Veterans at Risk for Developing Persistent Post-TKA Pain.”  
Funding mechanism: VA Career Development Award (Health Services area)  
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.  
Link to funding mechanism: Submitting LOI in October 2016 [http://www.research.va.gov/funding/cdp.cfm](http://www.research.va.gov/funding/cdp.cfm)

Cynthia LaFond, TBD  
Funding mechanism: Mayday Fund  
Brief description: Grant for a national or international PICU pain point prevalence study.  
Link to funding mechanism: [http://www.maydayfund.org/apply-for-a-grant/](http://www.maydayfund.org/apply-for-a-grant/)
**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.

---

**Group Leaders:**
- Janet Williams
- Kathy Clark

**Grant Writers:**
- Catherine Cherwin
- Ruth Grossmann
- Wen Liu

**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.

**Link to funding mechanisms:**
- ONS Research Grant information: [http://www.onsfoundation.org/apply/re/RE01](http://www.onsfoundation.org/apply/re/RE01)
- Information about to ACS-HCCC internal grants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM NAME</th>
<th>Holden Comprehensive Cancer Center - Seed Grants - American Cancer Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVES</td>
<td>For junior faculty members a one-year, cancer-focused research award supported through the Holden Comprehensive Cancer Center's American Cancer Society Institutional Research Grant. The purpose of these seed grant awards is to foster research in cancer that cannot readily be supported through other available sources, and to permit the initiation of promising new projects or novel ideas necessary to obtain the preliminary results for junior faculty to successfully compete for national research grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWARD</td>
<td>Up to $30,000 per award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDITIONS</td>
<td>Applicants are not eligible if they have grant support from a national agency, have previously served as P.I. on peer-reviewed grants from a national agency (even if such funding has expired), or if they have received prior support from the American Cancer Society. Recipients must submit a progress report, summarizing the results of the study supported by the ACS-IRG, with information on published papers and grant support as a result of, and separately from, the seed grant support received for the project, and copies of all publications resulting from the work. Annual updates will be required for five years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applications are accepted from junior faculty in all departments and Colleges at the University of Iowa. Applicants should be within six years of their first independent research or faculty appointment. Applications are encouraged from investigators performing basic or clinical research including cancer control, health services research, and behavioral/psychosocial research, and health policy and outcomes research related to cancer. ACS funds are intended to assist independent researchers in conducting initial explorations which may lead to publication(s) and a successful application for support from a national funding agency. These awards are NOT intended to provide bridge or other funding for more experienced investigators. Applicants must have completed training and be eligible to apply as principal investigator for grant support from a national agency, but not have any competitive grant at the time of application.

**DEADLINE**
Noon, Monday, October 26, 2015

**NOTIFICATION**
Notification of awards will be made in November 2015

**HOW TO APPLY**
Guidelines available on Holden website.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
Questions may be directed to Holden Comprehensive Cancer Center Administration, 353-8620. For information on the Holden Comprehensive Cancer Center (HCCC), please click here.

---

**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

**Link to potential funding mechanisms:**
- Innovation Grants to Nurture Initial Translational Efforts (IGNITE): Development and Validation of Model Systems and/or Pharmacodynamic Markers to Facilitate the Discovery of Neurotherapeutics (R21/R33)
- Link to more information on IGNITE:

---

**Wen Liu**, “Coordinating Dementia Care among Formal and Informal Caregivers.”

**Funding mechanism:** NIH R21 (see below)

**Brief description:** Background and purpose: Conflictual relationships are common among formal and informal caregivers of people with dementia due to the highly interdependent, uncertain and time-constrained nature of dementia caregiving. Current intervention research mostly focused on perspectives of either professional or family caregivers and were not concerned with coordinating relationships among them. The study purpose is to develop a Partners in Dementia Care (PDC) program and evaluate the impact on dementia care. The PDC
program focuses on teaching and motivating formal and informal caregivers to coordinate and sustain high-quality communication and relationships so as to effectively deliver high-quality individualized dementia care.

Methods: The study will use a mixed methods approach. Firstly, a qualitative approach will be used to understand facilitators and barriers of high-quality coordination among formal and informal dementia caregivers. A PDC program will then be developed using qualitative findings, and implemented by a PDC specialist in home settings. The impact of the PDC program will be evaluated among 50 triads of people with dementia and their formal and informal caregivers at baseline, three, and six months using a single-group pre-post design. Selection of eligible triads is based on identifying informal caregivers of people with dementia who currently use services of formal caregivers, or do not use formal caregivers but are interested in using the service. Outcome measures include relational coordination between caregivers, caregiver burden among informal caregivers, job satisfaction and caregiver burden among formal caregivers, and quality of life and anticipated probability of adverse events (nursing home placement, hospitalizations and emergency room visits) among people with dementia. Descriptive analysis will be used to describe the sample. Open coding will be used for qualitative data and multivariate paired t-test for quantitative data.

**Link to potential funding mechanism:** Research on Informal and Formal Caregiving for Alzheimer's Disease (R21)

Marianne Smith, “Statewide Collaboratory for Successful Aging in Place”

Funding mechanism: OVPRED Strategic Research Leadership Program (SRLP) – Phase 2 proposal

Brief description: We propose to develop a statewide, collaborative and coordinated research network to facilitate healthy aging in place in older adults’ homes and communities in both rural and urban settings that builds on successful models of academic-community partnerships; frameworks for active, engaged aging that blend health promotion with chronic illness management; and, mounting public health evidence related to the many social and community determinants of health. The collaboratory would be well positioned to submit P20/P30 Center grants from NIH, particularly the National Institutes on Aging and Nursing Research. Similarly, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s “Culture of Health” campaign and Wellmark’s Blue Zone solutions ($15M in Iowa) provide strong support, conceptually and financially, for engaging communities in healthy living solutions. Central support from the OVPR&ED will facilitate essential planning and resource mobilization to optimize our quick and effective responses to the rigorous time frames typically associated with foundation and Centers of Excellence funding announcements [e.g., RFA-NR-16-002, RFA-NR-12-006].

Link to potential funding mechanism: The goal of SRLP program is to help pave the pathway for funding a ‘big idea’. That ‘big idea’ should be captivating from a campus perspective and from a national funding perspective. It should address a national need and be focused on a specific agency or foundation. Collaborations from many disciplines and entities should be envisioned. The overarching goal for OVPR is to advance the institutional research enterprise and to facilitate long term funding initiatives through the SRLP.

Additional information requested for Phase 2 applicants:

Follow up on Strategic Research Leadership Program (SRLP) applications
OVPR would like additional information about your proposed application. Please provide a response to the questions and comments listed below.

The goal of SRLP program is to help pave the pathway for funding a ‘big idea’. That ‘big idea’ should be captivating from a campus perspective and from a national funding perspective. It should address a national need and be focused on a specific agency or foundation. Collaborations from many disciplines and entities should be envisioned. The overarching goal for OVPR is to advance the institutional research enterprise and to facilitate long term funding initiatives through the SRLP.

1) We need additional information about the focus of your proposal. What is the overarching major research question that the SRLP will seek to answer? What will be the strategic focus of the application, meaning why should the institution invest in this specific direction? How do participating departments, clusters, colleges and other entities benefit from this focused research? How does the institutional research enterprise advance as an outcome of the SRLP concept you have articulated? What national need is answered by your proposed research direction?

2) Innovation and collaboration are essential components for SRLP. What are the key innovations that will be developed and leveraged for the proposed SRLP project? Define the multi-collegiate collaborations that will be developed and, importantly, describe why they are essential for
success. What multi-institutional collaborations are envisioned and how will they strengthen an external grant application? What potential industrial partnerships will be established to broaden the scope of the proposal? How will these different but essential collaborations lead to innovative ideas and long term funding sustainability of the project?

3) **Many opportunities exist to achieve the desired research you propose.** Specifically, why are SRLP funds required to accomplish your goal that could otherwise not occur? How will the SRLP prepare the collaborating team to develop a successful external grant application? What are the 3 most important aspects of the SRLP plan that must be accomplished before submitting the external application for funding?

4) **Additional information is needed about the funding target of your application.** Which specific funding source will be the emphasis of the planning, multidisciplinary, and collaboration building process? Why is this funding target the most appropriate and how does it meet the SRLP requirement for a large-scale externally funded grant?

5) **Provide a detailed Phase II budget with justification.**
Group Leaders:
Toni Tripp-Reimer
Kristine Williams

Group D
Room 337

Grant Writers:
Amany Farag (attending only)
Patricia Groves
Lisa Segre and Maya Jordan (SROP student)
Janette Taylor

Patricia Groves, “Safety Simulation.”
Funding mechanism: NIH or AHRQ
Brief description: Full scale version of the CON RFP simulation safety study.
Potential funding mechanism: Advances in Patient Safety through Simulation Research (R18; PA-14-004)

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.
Potential funding mechanisms: UI OVPRED Major Project Grant http://research.uiowa.edu/researchers/find-funding/internal-funding-initiatives-ifi or Diana Benz Seed Grant from UI HCCC: http://www.uihealthcare.org/otherservices.aspx?id=21046
The Diana Benz Memorial Fund supports a cancer research seed grant up to $20,000 for a project related to psychosocial issues, complementary and alternative medicine, and other aspects of cancer research with a focus on quality of life for cancer patients and survivors. Any faculty or staff member at the University of Iowa is eligible to apply. The project to be supported will be selected by a peer-review process of all applications submitted to the Holden Cancer Center.

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 AccountMaking 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)**

**The NIH Grants Process: the Big Picture:** [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rNwsg_PR90w&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rNwsg_PR90w&feature=youtu.be)

**NIH Peer Review Experts Webinars:** [www.csr.nih.gov/webinar](http://www.csr.nih.gov/webinar) (4 different videos available)

**NIH Peer Review Revealed:** [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fBDxl6l4dOA&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fBDxl6l4dOA&feature=youtu.be) (14:51)

**NIH Tips for Applicants:** [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lAOGtr0pM6Q](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lAOGtr0pM6Q)

**Link to the NIH Online Grantsmanship Workshop Modules:**
[http://www.ninr.nih.gov/training/grantsmanship#.U1fh4xDt83A](http://www.ninr.nih.gov/training/grantsmanship#.U1fh4xDt83A)
Reviewer Assignments – Updated 6/13/2016

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 and to Linda Hand (linda-hand@uiowa.edu) 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)</th>
<th>Day 2 (Thursday, June 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being Reviewed · Group 1</td>
<td>Reviewer 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Reviewed · Group 2</td>
<td>Reviewer 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacinda Bunch</td>
<td>Cynthia Lafond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Cherwin</td>
<td>Wen Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Grossmann</td>
<td>Barbara St. Marie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Groves</td>
<td>Lisa Segre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Hadlandsmyth</td>
<td>Marianne Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynthia Lafond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wen Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara St. Marie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Segre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marianne Smith</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>Specific Aim 1</th>
<th>Specific Aim 2</th>
<th>Specific Aim 3</th>
<th>Specific Aim 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Variables/Outcome measure(s)</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How this will be collected: method, instrument, interview, items on a tool</td>
<td>When will this be collected?</td>
<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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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