PH 867 Seminar: Grant Proposal Writing for Health Behavior Research
Spring 2014, Schedule Number: 28675

Class Schedule: Tuesdays, 9:00am -11:40am
Location: ENS 213
Office Hours: By appointment
Instructor: Guadalupe X. Ayala, PhD, MPH, Professor
IBACH, 9245 Sky Park Court, Suite 220
San Diego, CA 92123
T: 619-594-6686; F: 619-594-2998

COURSE OVERVIEW AND GOALS
Through a seminar/small group discussion format, this course will train students in skills needed to successfully compete for research funding, with a specific focus on National Institutes of Health (NIH) funding, as well as other funding sources such as the Centers for Disease Prevention and Control, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s obesity prevention initiatives (Active Living Research, Healthy Eating Research), American Cancer Society, and others. Content will include hands-on experience with grant writing, submission, review, and revision processes, as well as vital information about NIH and other funders’ review and funding procedures and mechanisms.

COURSE OBJECTIVES MAPPED TO TEACHING AND EVALUATION METHODS
The course is designed around three objectives and corresponding teaching and evaluation methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Teaching methods</th>
<th>Evaluation methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe relevant NIH funding mechanisms, including RFAs, R01s, R21s, R03s, and K awards, and the typical 2-tiered review process for grants.</td>
<td>• Interactive lectures&lt;br&gt;• Discussions of readings on grant writing&lt;br&gt;*RePORT and mechanism seeking activities</td>
<td>• Participation (in and out of class)&lt;br&gt;• Completion of activities within grant proposal assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the general format for the NIH research proposal, and specific tips for strengthening sections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write (grant proposals and other documents) with greater conciseness, clarity, impact, and persuasiveness.</td>
<td>• Interactive lectures&lt;br&gt;• Discussions of readings on grant writing and student-led scientific writing&lt;br&gt;• Feedback on drafts including student-to-student</td>
<td>• Participation (in and out of class)&lt;br&gt;• Critique of R21&lt;br&gt;• Preparation of grant proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translate public health research findings into recommendations for a specific intervention or further research in the form of a grant proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe “how NIH reviewers think.”</td>
<td>• Group discussions&lt;br&gt;• Feedback on grant proposals including student-to-student&lt;br&gt;• Responding to reviews</td>
<td>• Critique fellow students’ proposals&lt;br&gt;• Response to reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise a research proposal to effectively address the reviewers’ concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH, THE HEALTH PROMOTION DIVISION
AND PH867
The Mission of San Diego State University's Graduate School of Public Health is to advance the public’s health through:

1. The preparation of professionals in public health practice through academic and professional education, research, and service using methods that analyze and manage unresolved community public health problems, and teach proactive, interactive and accountable approaches to their solution;

2. The provision of interdisciplinary leadership and direct assistance by being a regional and international resource in public health education, research and advocacy in defining and solving public health problems in the various multicultural populations both nationally and internationally, especially in the border region of California and the Pacific Rim; and

3. Serving as a catalyst and vehicle for forming and maintaining collaborative relationships among public health, preventive and curative health-related academic, health care delivery, and financing, and community and service organizations in both the public and private sectors to strengthen capacities and services and to help resolve community public health issues and problems.

Working within this broader mission, the Division of Health Promotion and Behavioral Sciences trains students at the Undergraduate, Masters and Ph.D. levels in theory, research and practical applications in planning, implementing and evaluating public health behavior change efforts. PH867 students focus specifically on acquiring grant writing skills to compete successfully for grant funding.

Plagiarism:
Academic dishonesty is an affront to the integrity of scholarship at SDSU and a threat to the quality of learning. Violations of academic integrity are noted in the SDSU Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities:

2.1 Cheating shall be defined as the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work by the use of dishonest, deceptive, or fraudulent means. Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to (a) copying, in part or in whole, from another’s test or other examination; (b) discussing answers or ideas relating to the answers on a test or other examination without the permission of the instructor; (c) obtaining copies of a test, an examination, or other course material without the permission of the instructor; (d) using notes, cheat sheets, or other devices considered inappropriate under the prescribed testing condition; (e) collaborating with another or others in work to be presented without the permission of the instructor; (f) falsifying records, laboratory work, or other course data; (g) submitting work previously presented in another course, if contrary to the rules of the course; (h) altering or interfering with the grading procedures; (i) plagiarizing, as defined; and (j) knowingly and intentionally assisting another student in any of the above.

2.2 Plagiarism shall be defined as the act of incorporating ideas, words, or specific substance of another, whether purchased, borrowed, or otherwise obtained, and submitting same to the University as one’s own work to fulfill academic requirements without giving credit to the appropriate source. Plagiarism shall include but not be limited to (a) submitting work, either in part or in whole, completed by another; (b) omitting footnotes for ideas, statements, facts, or conclusions that belong to another; (c) omitting quotation marks when quoting directly from another, whether it be a paragraph, sentence, or part thereof; (d) close and lengthy paraphrasing of the writings of another; (e) submitting another person’s artistic works, such as musical compositions, photographs, paintings, drawings, or sculptures; and (f) submitting as one’s own work papers purchased from research companies.

3.0 Academic and Punitive Sanctions: Cheating and plagiarism in connection with the academic program at The University may warrant two separate and distinct courses of disciplinary action that may be applied concurrently in
response to a violation of this policy: (a) academic sanctions, such as grade modifications; and (b) punitive sanctions, such as probation, suspension, or expulsion.

All students in this class are required to complete the online information literacy tutorial, "Plagiarism: The Crime of Intellectual Kidnapping," a 30-minute tutorial that teaches students about plagiarism, paraphrasing, and citing sources. Students are to take this tutorial outside of class time and take the quiz that follows it. They will receive a score on screen that they can print and this printed score must be submitted as proof of completion by the third week of class. The tutorial is at http://infotutor.sdsu.edu/plagiarism/.

Student Disability Services:
If you are a student with a disability and believe you will need accommodations for this class, it is your responsibility to contact Student Disability Services at (619) 594-6473. To avoid any delay in the receipt of your accommodations, you should contact Student Disability Services as soon as possible. Please note that accommodations are not retroactive, and that I cannot provide accommodations based upon disability until I have received an accommodation letter from Student Disability Services. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Religious holidays:
According to the University Policy File, students should notify the instructors of affected courses of planned absences for religious observances by the end of the second week of classes.

Incomplete:
Medical emergencies verified by practicing clinicians and limited other emergencies are the basis for an incomplete.

Academic calendar for Spring 2014:
http://arweb.sdsu.edu/es/registrar/academiccalendar.html

Required text and materials:
- NIH 398 and 424 guidebooks (Available on Blackboard under Assignment/Grant Proposal)
- Other materials and links available on Blackboard.

Final grade:
A. Participation 20
   There are two parts to participation, each worth 10 points. Part 1 involves in-class participation and Part 2 involves participation in a grant writing activity outside of class.

   In-class participation involves regular attendance, completion of the assignments on time, contributing to in-class discussions, and critiquing each other’s writing in a helpful way. Please make plans to attend all classes. Small classes such as this one function best when all are present. Also, I anticipate that we will exchange many written messages over the course of the semester. Emails and other communication should always look professional, including proper salutation, good English, correct grammar, etc. Unless you have a compelling reason not to, you would “market” yourselves best by having an SDSU.EDU or UCSD.EDU address.
On Week 8, you will receive feedback on your class participation using the form included in this syllabus. This completed form will include your anticipated final points assuming no changes are made to participation.

Out-of-class participation can include involvement in the development and writing of a grant proposal with a faculty member, interviewing a faculty member about grant writing, attendance at a grant writing workshop, or another skill development opportunity identified by the student and approved by the instructor. **Final decisions about how the student will complete this requirement should be made by the date indicated in the schedule.**

The overarching goal of the out-of-class activity is to connect some of what you may already be doing outside of class to in-class activities, thereby enriching both experiences. If you elect to work with a faculty member, the hope is that your participation is active, for example, you are a regular participant at grant development meetings, you are writing sections of the grant proposal, you are collecting formative data, etc. If you would like to experience the grant writing activity and don’t know of any such opportunities, please let me and we can identify an opportunity together.

Interviewing a faculty member will give you a firsthand perspective on the grant writing process, and more generally on that aspect of the faculty member’s life. This interview may yield valuable tips on how to survive and excel in this area. **The script must be approved by Dr. Ayala.**

A workshop will provide you with some of the necessary skills to write grants effectively. I have identified several offered by SDSURF (see Blackboard folder) but I am sure you will come across others.

Irrespective of which option you select, you are expected to write a short reflection paper (1,000 words ≈ 2 single spaced pages, 12-point font, 1 inch margins) on your experiences. Reflections on what you learned that will generalize to your own grant writing are most welcome. **There are no other written grading criteria for this assignment except that it should adhere to these format guidelines, your assignment must be approved a priori, and the 2-page paper must be turned in by week 12 (April 15). Failure to meet any of these requirements will result in an automatic 20% drop in points (from 10 to 8 points).**

B. Critique an R21 grant proposal
   10
   Write a critique of an NIH grant proposal and participate in a mock study section. See guidelines for additional details.

C. Prepare an R21 grant proposal, write the introduction to revised application, and critique other students’ proposals
   70
   Write a grant proposal, write a response to reviewers of your grant proposal (that is the introduction to revised applications), and critique your classmates’ grant proposals. The points break down as follows: 40 for your proposal, 10 for your introduction to revised application, and 20 for your critiques. See guidelines for additional details.

Grading:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Minimum Score</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>95-100</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90-94</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87-89</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>84-86</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80-83</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This schedule may be modified over the course of the semester to meet class needs and competencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>In-Class Activity</th>
<th>Readings and Assignments Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1: Jan 28 | Introduction to course  
   - Dual focus on grant writing and writing in general  
   - Tips for successful grant writing  
   Introduction to NIH RePORT | Complete three student handouts, share experiences in grant writing and what you hope to gain from this class.  
Sign confidentiality statement. | None |
| Repeat key terms | Writing Workshop led by:  
   Suchi | None |
| 2: Feb 4 | Types of grant proposal mechanisms at NIH  
Types of funding agencies and what they are interested in from you as an applicant: NIH, RWJF, & ACS. | Be prepared to discuss R&M readings.  
Be prepared to discuss what you learned from the RePORT activity. | Read R&M Preface, Overview, Chs. 1-3.  
RePORT assignment due in class in hard copy. |
| Keep sentences short AND Avoid pretensions,… | Writing Workshop led by:  
   LaRocque – Tip 1 & 2 | |
| 3: Feb 11 | Developing a program of research through funding and creating a writing schedule.  
Budgets and budget justifications. | Be prepared to discuss R&M readings.  
Be prepared to briefly (5 mins) share which program announcement or request for application that you identified. | Read R&M Chs. 6, 13 & 14.  
Read NIH 398 and 424 guidelines on budgets.  
Bring 2-3 PAs or RFAs that you are considering applying to.  
Complete online plagiarism tutorial and submit confirmation to instructor. |
| Change long and …. AND Be wary of jargon… | Writing Workshop led by:  
   LaRocque – Tip 3 & 4 | |
| 4: Feb 18 | Writing the Specific Aims  
*Due to CEPH, we will start at 9:30am and end at noon* | Be prepared to discuss R&M readings.  
Be prepared to briefly (5 mins) share your writing schedule. | Read R&M Overview, Chs. 7-8.  
Writing schedule assignment due in class in hard copy.  
**Grant Proposal:** Read the NIH R21 guidelines (see Blackboard/Assignments/Grant Proposal link). |
| Use the right word AND Avoid beginning with… | Writing Workshop led by:  
   LaRocque – Tip 5 & 6 | |
<p>| 5: Feb 25 | View NIH review video | NO in-class session this week |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reading/Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6: March 4</td>
<td>NIH Grant review process</td>
<td>Be prepared to discuss R&amp;M reading.</td>
<td>Read R&amp;M Ch. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compare proposal critiques</td>
<td>Be prepared to share your critiques of Ayala’s R21 grant proposal.</td>
<td>Grant Proposal: Submit a draft of your Specific Aims via Turnitin on Blackboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R21 Critique: Critique of Ayala’s grant proposal due in class in hard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>copy (need 3 volunteers to serve on study section).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefer active verbs AND Cut wordiness</td>
<td>Writing Workshop led by: ____</td>
<td>LaRocque – Tip 7 &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: March 11</td>
<td>Writing the</td>
<td>Be prepared to discuss R&amp;M reading.</td>
<td>Read R&amp;M Overview, Ch 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Significance</td>
<td>Review 2 students Specific Aims.</td>
<td>Read the two Specific Aims we will discuss in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finalize out-of-class participation assignment with instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid vague qualifiers AND Prune prepositions</td>
<td>Writing Workshop led by: ____</td>
<td>LaRocque – Tip 9 &amp; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: March 18</td>
<td>Approach, including preliminary studies</td>
<td>Be prepared to discuss R&amp;M readings.</td>
<td>Read R&amp;M Chs. 10-11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review 3 students Specific Aims.</td>
<td>Read the three Specific Aims we will discuss in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limit number and symbol AND Get right to the point,…</td>
<td>Writing Workshop led by: ____</td>
<td>Grant Proposal: Submit a draft of your Significance and Innovation sections via Turnitin on Blackboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Receiver feedback on participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: March 25</td>
<td>Writing the Title, Summary, Cover Letter</td>
<td>Be prepared to discuss R&amp;M readings.</td>
<td>Read R&amp;M Chs. 17-21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Split infinitives, Split verb phrases, Ending a sentence…,</td>
<td>Writing Workshop led by: ____</td>
<td>Grant Proposal: Submit a draft of your Approach via Turnitin on Blackboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND Starting sentences with and or but</td>
<td></td>
<td>LaRocque – Dispelling myths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: April 1</td>
<td>Spring break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: April 8</td>
<td>Leadership, Multiple PI plan Biosketches</td>
<td>Be prepared to discuss R&amp;M readings.</td>
<td>Read R&amp;M Chs. 12, 15, &amp; 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing the Human Subjects and Data Safety and Monitoring Boards</td>
<td>Review what to turn in for final document</td>
<td>Grant Proposal: Open-session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quick review on budget Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructions AND Restoring the serial comma</td>
<td>Writing Workshop led by: ____</td>
<td>LaRocque – Dispelling myths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Reading/Preparation</td>
<td>Assignment/Proposal Due Date/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: April 15</td>
<td>Preparing your grant reviews. Writing the Introduction to Revised Application.</td>
<td>Read R&amp;M Ch. 5. Reread grant review guidelines under Assignments/Critique R21. Read NIH guides 398 and 424 on topic (search for ‘introduction to’) under Assignments/Grant Proposal.</td>
<td>Grant Proposal: Final due date. Last day to turn in hard-copy reflection paper for out-of-class participation component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: April 22</td>
<td>Review session #1</td>
<td>None and couple, Keeping that, AND A and an</td>
<td>Writing Workshop led by: LaRocque – Dispelling myths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: April 29</td>
<td>Review session #2</td>
<td>Grant Proposal: You will be randomly assigned to review your fellow students’ grant proposals. We will review these over the course of two days with each of you serving as a primary, secondary, or tertiary reviewer in a traditional NIH study section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: May 6</td>
<td>Wrap up and your next steps in grant writing.</td>
<td>During class we will discuss your approach to writing the response, and your overall experience with grant writing.</td>
<td>Grant Proposal: Introduction to reviewer comments due for those whose grants were reviewed on April 22 (the April 29th folks have until May 13th).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Grading Rubric for Class Participation

**PH 867 Seminar: Grant Proposal Writing for Health Behavior Research**

**10 points possible**

**Student Name:** _________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Criterion / Evaluation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Excellent (3)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fair (2)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Poor (1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Completion of assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Completed on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Turned in as required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Listens respectfully to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Seeks others opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Actively engaged in learning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Reads the materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Demonstrates critical thinking including synthesizing information across sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Has own questions about content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Generalizing information to other aspects of her/his work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total points: __________ +1 = _____**

## Comments


Critiquing an R21 proposal

Write a critique of the proposal using the reviewer guidelines and templates provided in Blackboard.

You should give the following sections both a score (1 to 9, with 1 being the best—to the right of each heading) and a written review, with key strengths and weaknesses: Overall Impact; Significance; Investigator; Innovation; Approach; and Environment. Use whole sentences, even though this is in bulleted format.

IMPORTANT – Although the above are the most important sections to complete, please be sure to complete all sections of the template. Failure to complete all sections will result in an automatic 20% drop in points (from 10 to 8 points).

Use the following materials to write your critique:

1) See Assignments/Critique R21: a) NIH guidelines for reviewers (be sure and read the Reviewer Orientation and other relevant instructions); and b) the “Review Critique Template” (most recent version) for an R21.

2) Additional examples of grant submitted and critiques received will be uploaded as I receive them from other faculty. Some of these may provide more limited guidance given that they used the old format.

Turn in a hard copy of your critique to Dr. Ayala in class on the deadline date. We will identify three volunteers to conduct a mock study section.

Immediately after the review, we will see the actual study section’s critique so you can see how you compared with the other ‘real’ NIH reviewers.
Grant Proposal Instructions

You will write a proposal for a small grant (R21) in any health behavior research area you choose. The study can be either an observational (i.e., nonintervention) study or an intervention study. Along the way, you will see requests for the items to ensure that you are adhering to some sort of timeline. Please make sure to complete all assignments and turn them in on time.

Follow the instructions (see NIH guidebooks 398 and 424) regarding font size, margins, and other formatting requirements. Look at the NIH Small Grant (R21) description (in Blackboard) and look at your identified program announcement or request for applications to ensure you are also meeting these guidelines. However, any instructions I provide here will supersede any other instructions, should the two sources differ.

Sections to include:
1. Cover letter requesting (and giving justification for) a specific, actual NIH study section and an NIH Institute or Center
2. Face page (Form Page One) of PHS 398.
3. Project Summary and public health relevance.
4. Your NIH biosketch (no others) using PHS 398.
5. Main body of proposal (not to exceed 7 single-spaced pages):
   A. Specific Aims (1 page)
   B. Research Strategy (6 pages), including the following sections: Significance; Innovation; and Approach (which includes preliminary studies).

   In Preliminary Studies section:
   Required: describe the roles and expertise of the members of your research team.
   Include only if you have this: Describe any preliminary studies conducted by you or other members of the research team that are relevant to the proposed project. Describe any relevant pilot data.
6. Human Subjects, DSMB (if appropriate) and Targeted Enrollment Tables
7. Literature Cited
8. Proposed letters of support – do not include actual letters. Just state who you would ask to provide letters.

The project may not exceed 2 years. The budget may not exceed $275,000 in direct costs (see budget guidelines for additional details). However, unlike NIH guidelines, you will submit a complete excel budget and a budget justification (and not a modular budget).

Ideas for types of research
A. Methodological Studies
   1. develop and validate a new measure
   2. collect reliability and validity data on an existing measure
B. Observational (Non-intervention) Studies
   1. collect cross-sectional data to evaluate correlates of a health behavior (or condition)
   2. collect longitudinal data to evaluate predictors of a health behavior (or condition)
   3. analyze existing data set to assess correlates/predictors
C. Intervention-Related Research
   1. Conduct formative evaluation and use it to develop an intervention
   2. Pilot test a previously developed intervention (with a new population)
   3. Both 1 and 2
   4. Conduct a small, controlled study
This list is not all-inclusive. But remember to keep your proposed research relatively narrow in scope, not overly-complex, and feasible. Make a case for how the findings will inform a future, larger study and or randomized controlled trial (R01 mechanism). For example, the ideas under “B” could help researchers develop more effective interventions. C 2-4 studies could generate valuable data regarding sample size calculations (i.e., effect size), acceptability, and feasibility for future trials. Studies in A are crucial for advancing research in general. Additionally, the results may suggest whether a particular measurement tool or strategy is justified for use in a larger, expensive study.

**Grading your proposal**

I will use all of the formal NIH Review Criteria for R21s (Significance, Approach, etc.). However, you are not expected to have pilot data. Additionally, I will consider the following factors:

- Is the scope of your proposed study appropriately narrow (and feasible) for an R21?
- Is the design simple, yet elegant?
- Have you organized the content so that it is easy to follow and tells a coherent story?
- Did you follow LaRocque’s guide for good writing?
- Is the proposal legible? Does the presentation facilitate the reader’s job (e.g., appropriate use of tables, etc.)?
- Have you eliminated typos and other physical problems?
- Have you complied with the NIH rules for fonts, margins, etc.?
RePORT Assignment

Objectives:
- To become familiar with the NIH RePORT data base.
- To see what types of studies NIH has funded that are similar to your own.

Instructions:
- Think of possible research topics that you might want to explore in your R12 and write out a few search terms.
- Go to Research Portfolio Online Reporting Tool (http://projectreporter.nih.gov/reporter.cfm)
- Type in your preferred topic at “text search”.
- Select the year(s) you want.
- Select research projects at “funding mechanism”.
- Submit query.
- From the hit list, select from R01’s, R03’s, or R21’s that are related to your research topic —click on the title to get to the abstract.
- Browse abstracts on RePORT, and using a minimum of 10 abstracts, summarize your findings considering the following questions:
  - What innovative ideas is NIH funding?
  - What gaps are evident from what is being funded?
  - What innovations can I introduce that would complement what has been funded?
- Turn in a 500-word summary of what you learned (in hard copy), including the titles and PIs of the abstracts read, and be prepared to share this in class.
PH 867 - Student Information Sheet

Name: ________________________________________________________________

Phone number: _________________________________________________________

Emergency contact information: _________________________________________

1. Grant writing experience, indicate if as principal investigator.
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

2. What are you short-term (2-3 years) and longer term (5-8 years) goals for grant proposal submission?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

3. What are you most worried about in this class?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

4. Is there anything else you want me to know about you that will help me tailor the class?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________