

Workshop: NIH Large Instrumentation Programs (S10)

2017 Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOAs):

**PAR-17-074: Shared Instrumentation Grant (SIG) Program
&**

PAR-17-076: High-End Instrumentation (HEI) Grant Program

2017 Deadlines:

5/22/17 to DSP via UFIRST

5/31/17 Application to NIH

What we will cover

1. Internal Review:
 - Process
 - Why It's important
2. High-Level Overview of FOAs
 - <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PAR-17-074.html>
 - <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PAR-17-076.html>
3. PD/PI: Requirements & eligibility
4. Advisory Committee: Requirements
5. Major User Group: Requirements & minimum eligibility
6. Overview Proposal requirements:
 - Specific Section Limitations
 - Other Attachments
7. NIH Review & Contact Information

Internal Review Process

- PIs to submit proposal docs to ADR per their college/department deadline
 - If resubmission, PI is also to provide Review Comments from previous submission and Response to Review Comments to ADRs at time of internal review
- ADRs review proposals and advise RPD of PIs selected from their College/Department to go forward for current FOA(s)
- RPD provides UFHealth Executive VP for Research and Education, and ADRs with list of SIG/HEI awards & equipment for past 5 years
- Exec VP and ADRs, RPD assist faculty with identifying additional user groups
- Once selected to go forwards, PIs to provide RPD with (internal tracking):
 - layman paragraph description of requested equipment/system;
 - Reviewer Comments, if resubmission;
 - Response to Reviewer Comments, if resubmission

Internal Review Process: Why It's Important

- No limit on the number of applications that can be submitted by UF, however, applications must request different types of equipment\
- Rationale for non access if duplicate instruments are requested
- Internal Review for Quality Control:
 - ADRs need to be kept informed
 - Usage of instruments purchased under previous awards will be scrutinized by study section
 - Grant funded instruments **MUST** be referenced in Publications

High-Level Overview

- **SIG:** \$50,000 - \$600,000
- **HEI:** \$600,001 - \$2,000,000
 - Special Use Instrument (SUI)

SIG & HEI:

- Awards are made for one year only
- Requested equipment must be used for Biomedical research
- Single PD/PI listed on application
- Advisory Committee
- Major User Group
- Senior/Key Person Profile: PD/PI only
(changed from previous FOAs, see Biosketches for Major/Minor Users & technical personnel)
- Specific Section Limitations
- Other Attachments section
 - Instrumentation Plan
 - Letters of Support (LOS)
 - Biosketches for Major/Minor Users & technical personnel

PD/PI Requirements & Eligibility

SIG & HEI

- PD/PI has eRA Commons account affiliated with UF
- Is an expert on the requested instrument
- Technical expertise directly related to instrument must be documented in PD/PI's biographical sketch
- Will assume administrative & scientific oversight responsibility for requested instrumentation

Advisory Committee Requirements

Advisory Committee (AC) has been identified and complies with instructions and composition requirements, including:

- AC members' names & titles are listed
- AC membership is a balanced interest of different users
- Some AC members are non-users of requested instrument (have no conflicts of interest)
- AC includes at least one senior UF official who represents UF's financial commitment
- Chair of AC committee is NOT an active User of instrument
- PD/PI is NOT a voting member of AC

Major User Group: SIG

- At least Three Major Users identified.
- Each Major User is a PD/PI on a distinct active NIH research award in an area of basic, translational, or clinical research.
- No Major Users are PDs/Pis only on NIH training or fellowship grants or other non-research grants.
- Major Users meet eligibility requirements at time of proposal submission.
- Once Major user eligibility has been met, additional users with active research awards from NIH or other sources may be added as Major or Minor Users.
- Projects supported by NIH research grants together require at least 75 percent of the Accessible User Time (AUT).
- Major Users supported by NIH grants together require at least 35 percent of the AUT.

Major User Group: HEI

- At least Three Major Users identified.
- Each Major User is a PD/PI on a distinct active NIH research award in an area of basic, translational, or clinical research
- No Major Users are PDs/Pis only on NIH training or fellowship grants or other non-research grants
- Major Users meet eligibility requirements at time of proposal submission
- Once Major user eligibility has been met, additional users with active research awards from NIH or other sources may be added as Major or Minor Users
- Projects supported by NIH research grants together require at least 75 percent of the Accessible User Time (AUT) (or Biomedical Research Time [BRT] if SUI is requested)
- Major Users supported by NIH grants together require at least 35 percent of the AUT (or BRT if SUI is requested)

Overview – Specific Section Limitations & Requirements

SIG & HEI – follow FOA instructions

- Project Summary/Abstract – 30 lines of text or less.
- **Project Narrative – 2 or 3 sentences for general lay audience.**
- Bibliography & References Cited – publications listed demonstrate researchers' expertise in requested instrument or are relevant to research projects supported by the instrument.
- Equipment attachment – includes:
 - Complete description of instrument manufacturer, model number, specific features & accessories;
 - Detailed budget breakdown of instrument and accessories, including any tax and import duties;
 - Itemized quote from Vendor, with any appropriate discount.
- Senior/Key Person – profile of PD/PI only.
 - Current & Pending required for PD/PI at time of submission.

Overview:

Other Attachments

- Instrumentation Plan
 - No page limit for the entire Instrumentation Plan, however, page limitations apply to specific sections
- Letters of Support – no page limit
- Biosketches: Major/Minor Users and technical personnel – no page limit

Instrumentation Plan

Upload a single PDF, filename “Instrumentation Plan” under Other Attachments with below sections, as appropriate – in all cases, follow FOA instructions carefully.

Introduction: 3 pages (Resubmission applications only)

Justification of Need†: 9 pages (include SUI [HEI], if applicable).

Technical Expertise†: 3 pages.

Research Projects†: must not exceed 30 pages. Section may be subdivided into:

(a) “Specific Research Topics” or

(b) “Research Projects of Major Users”: ***4 pages or less per Major User.***

If appropriate, section should conclude with subsection “Other Users’ Projects”:
4 pages total (all Minor & Other User’s projects).

Summary Table(s): 6 pages.

Administration (Organizational/Management Plan)†: 6 pages. Follow FOA instructions for Advisory Committee (AC), managing access (as appropriate), and a financial plan.

Special Use Instrument (SUI): only if applicable.

Institutional Commitment†: 3 pages.

Overall Benefit: 3 pages.

Instrumentation Plan -2-

Justification of Need†: 9 pages (include SUI [HEI], if applicable).

- Compare performance of requested model with similar instruments
- Provide explanation for why this instrument is the best choice
- Justify need for specific features and accessories (3 Major user/accessory minimum)
- Define and justify Accessible User Time (AUT)
- Are you listing a similar instrument at unavailable? Documentation required!!

Technical Expertise†: 3 pages.

- Who will set up and run the instrument?
- Who will train other users?
- What technical support is available for data collection, management, and analysis

Instrumentation Plan -3-

Research Projects[†]: must not exceed 30 pages. Section may be subdivided into:

(a) “Specific Research Topics” or

List Major users, their grants, and their usage (as a % of the AUT)

(b) “Research Projects of Major Users”: **4 pages or less per Major User.**

List the PD/PI name and grant information in the beginning of each subsection

If appropriate, section should conclude with subsection “Other Users’ Projects”: **4 pages total** (all Minor & Other User’s projects).

- How will the new instrument advance the research objectives of the listed projects?
- Do NOT copy the Specific Aims from funded applications
- Will these projects benefit from the accessories/special features of the new instrument?

NIH funded investigators must use at least 75% of the AUT.

Instrumentation Plan -4-

Summary Table(s): 6 pages.

- Table summarizing Research Projects of Users - check Overview document/FOA for required fields
- Table of users' needs for requested accessories

Administration (Organizational/Management Plan)†: 6 pages.

- Advisory Committee (AC),
- Plan for managing access (as appropriate),
- Financial plan for long term operation and maintenance.

Further details are provided in Overview Document/FOA.

Special Use Instrument (SUI): only if applicable.

Institutional Commitment†: 3 pages.

Overall Benefit: 3 pages.

LOS & Biosketches

(Major & Minor Users, Technical Personnel)

LOS:

Upload as a single PDF, filename “Letters of Support” under Other Attachments – no page limit. Follow FOA instructions.

Include, as appropriate, letters from institutional officials:

- Institutional back-up for financial plan
- Inventory of UF instruments unavailable to PD/PI (as noted in Justification of Need)
- Performance of all previous S10-awarded instruments for last 5 years (2011-2016)
- Letter from IRB, IACUC, or Compliance Office

Biosketches:

Upload as a single PDF, filename “Biosketches” (NIH format) under Other Attachments – no page limit.

- Include for all Major Users, Minor Users, and technical personnel.

Successful Applications

2013 Awardees:

Charles Baer: CLAS (cbaer@ufl.edu)

Martha Campbell-Thompson: COM (thompmc@pathology.ufl.edu)

2015 Awardees:

Nancy Denslow: VetMed (ndenslow@ufl.edu)

Habibeh Khosbouei: Pharmacy (habibeh@ufl.edu)

Available for consultation:

Joanna Long – Director AMRIS (jrlong@mbi.ufl.edu)

Application Review

➤ Overall Impact/Benefit

Reviewers will provide an overall benefit score to reflect their assessment that the requested instrument will exert a sustained, powerful influence on the conduct of research projects and their scientific outcomes.

➤ Scored Review Criteria

Reviewers will consider each of the review criteria (right) in the determination of scientific merit and give a separate score for each. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have a major scientific impact/benefit.

➤ Criteria

Only the review criteria listed below will be considered in the review process:

- Justification of Need
- Technical Expertise
- Research Projects
- Administration – including SUI
- Institutional Commitment

Additional Review Criteria

➤ Resubmission

Committee will evaluate the application as now presented – taking into consideration the responses to comments from the previous scientific review group and changes made to the project.

➤ Other Criteria

- **Biohazards:** Reviewers will assess whether materials or procedures proposed are potentially hazardous to research personnel and/or the environment, and if needed, determine whether adequate protection is proposed.
- **Budget:** Reviewers will consider whether the budget and requested period of support are fully justified and reasonable in relation to the proposed research. Reviewers will comment whether applicants employed the best economical approaches, including securing academic discounts, to formulate the cost-effective budget while meeting users' scientific needs
- The following criteria are not generally applicable, however, reviewers are to bring any concerns to the attention of the Scientific Review Officer:
 - Protections for Human Subjects
 - Inclusion of Women, Minorities, and Children
 - Vertebrate Animals

NIH Review & Selection Process

As part of the scientific peer review process, all applications:

- May undergo a selection process in which only those applications deemed to have the highest scientific and technical merit (generally top half of applications under review) will be discussed and assigned an overall impact score
- Will receive a written critique
- Review dates:
 - Scientific Merit Review: August-November, 2017
 - Advisory Council Review: January 2018
 - Earliest Start Date: February 1, 2018
- NIH Scientific Contact (provide name and address to institutional officials):
 - SIG: Alena Horska
 - HEI: Abraham Levy
 - Office of Research Infrastructure

NIH Contacts

SIG – Scientific/Research Contact:

Dr. Alena Horska, Office of Research Infrastructure Programs (ORIP)

Telephone: (301) 435-0772

Email: SIG@mail.nih.gov

HEI – Scientific/Research Contact:

Dr. Abraham Levy, Office of Research Infrastructure Programs (ORIP)

Telephone: (301) 435-0772

Email: HEI@mail.nih.gov

SIG & HEI – Peer Review Contact:

Dr. Nuria Assa-Munt, Center for Scientific Review

Telephone: (301) 451-1323

Email: assamunu@csr.nih.gov

Questions?

Contact us

UF Health Science Center

Executive Associate Vice President for Research and Education

Dr. Thomas Pearson: tapearson@ufl.edu

Melody Trapani: mtrapani@ufl.edu

Phone: (352)-733-1800

Office of Research

Research Program Development

Website: <http://research.ufl.edu/faculty-and-staff/finding-funding.html>

Email: programdevelopment@research.ufl.edu

Phone: (352) 392-4804