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Budget Basics

What is a project budget?

- A **project budget** is the estimated financial plan for a project
- Include the expenses you anticipate to incur for a specified period of time.
- It represents a financial picture of the project.

A well-crafted budget can add greatly to the reviewer's understanding of your project.
Budget Strategy

- Best Strategy is to request a reasonable amount of money to do the work.
- Reviewers look for reasonable costs and compare costs to your aims.
- Reviewers will look at the person/calendar months you’ve listed to do the work.
- Significant over or under budgeting may indicate that you do not understand the scope of work.

Agency Guidelines-general

Read the instructions or the FOA (Funding Opportunity Announcement) carefully.

The guidelines give you:
- Eligibility requirements
- Your dollar limit, if any
- Number of years to complete the grant
- Which costs are allowable
- Does the agency require you to cost share?
- Do they limit F&A (a.k.a Indirect Costs)?
- Do they prohibit certain cost categories? Like travel?
- Specific forms or format?
Types of Costs

- **Two Types of Costs:**
  - **Direct Costs**
    - Salary, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, lab supplies
    - Costs associated with a specific project
  - **Indirect Costs**
    - aka Facilities & Administration (F&A) or overhead
      - Utilities, admin support, general office supplies
      - Current F&A rate is 53%

Direct Costs

Personnel/Salaries:
- UW Employees who will direct effort to the grant, e.g. PIs, Post Docs, Students
- Should reflect the amount of time that person will spend on the project (EFFORT=SALARY)

Fringe Benefits:
- Should reflect UW’s approved rates

UW 2017 rates:
  - [http://www.rsp.wisc.edu/rates/index.html](http://www.rsp.wisc.edu/rates/index.html)
- Includes: Health Insurance, Social Security, Retirement, Vacation/Sick Leave, FICA
### Fringe Benefit Rates FY 2017

- Regular Faculty and Academic Staff: **39.7%**
- Regular Classified: **51.6%**
- Research Associates and Grad Interns: **24.7%**
- Research Assistants, Project Assistants, Teaching Assist, Pre-Doc Fellows and/or Trainees: **23.5%**
- Post-Doc Fellows and/or Trainees: **17.8%**
- Limited Term Employees (LTE’s): **9.8%**
- Ad Hoc Program Specialists, Undergraduate Assistants and Undergraduate Interns: **1.0%**
- Student Hourly Employees: **3.3%**

---

### Notice of Correction to Salary Limitation on NIH Grants, Agreements

**Notice Number:** NOT-OD-16-059

**Key Dates**
- **Release Date:** January 28, 2016

**Related Announcements**
- NOT OD 16-018
- NOT-OD-16-045
- NOT-OD-16-044

**Issued by**
- National Institutes of Health (NIH)

**Purpose**

This Notice has been reissued to remove all references to NIH extramural research and development contract awards and supplement the salary limitation will exclusively be applied to NIH grant and cooperative agreement awards. For FY 2016, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (H.R. 2029), signed into law on December 18, 2015, restricts the amounts. The Executive pay scale. The Executive Level II salary was previously set at $183,300, and increased to $185,100 effective January.

**Background**

---
2016 NRSA guidelines for student salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Level</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Stipend for FY 2016</th>
<th>Monthly Stipend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predoctoral</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>$23,376</td>
<td>$1,948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Postdoctoral: For institutional training grants, (T32, T00, TL1) and individual fellowships (F32), the stipend level for the entire first year of salary support is based on relevant postdoctoral experience when the award is issued. Relevant experience may include research experience (including industrial, teaching, practice, or other time spent in a health-related field beyond that of the qualifying doctoral degree). Once the appropriate stipend level has been established, it is assumed to be a level for the entire grant year. The stipend for each additional year of institutional support is the next level in the stipend structure and should be commensurate with the level of postdoctoral experience.

Key Personnel/Other Personnel

Determine the amount of time (effort) and expertise is required to accomplish your specific objectives?

- Number of people, expertise and their level of effort involved (faculty and staff).
- Individuals on UW’s payroll are personnel; non-UW personnel participate as consultants, sub-recipients or contractors (vendors).
- Will your staffing needs change over the life of the grant?
  - You, Other faculty & staff
  - Postdoctoral fellows and Graduate students
  - Technicians
Who are Key Personnel?

Key Personnel are those that contribute to the grant in such a way that the grant cannot be done without them

- Most MD’s or PhD’s could be key
- Postdoc’s or students may leave so may or may not be key
- If someone is named a “key” player and he/she leaves that person must be replaced on the grant and information on the new person is sent to NIH

Personnel (continued)

- There are no magic numbers regarding the qualifications and/or number of individuals needed for each aim.

- Be realistic about what each individual can accomplish, and the time necessary to complete the work.

- Is total FTE reasonable for this project?
Cost Sharing

• **Cost Share** is effort that is not paid by the current grant. 30% effort is paid as 30%
• Not required as a condition of applying for/receiving most unsolicited NIH awards
• Only a few NIH solicited programs that require cost sharing
• Mandatory cost sharing for salary in excess of current NIH salary cap ($185,100); called cap share.
• **Cost Sharing should be limited per department and SMPH guidelines**

Other Direct Costs

• NON Personnel:
  • Equipment
  • Consultants
  • Travel
  • Supplies
  • Publication Costs
  • Tuition
  • Subcontracts
Equipment

- **Do you need equipment for the project?**
  - Equipment – UW definition of equipment is items which cost >$5,000 with a useful life of more than one year.
  - Does your equipment require special installation or renovation?
  - **Equipment should be project specific – be sure to include a written justification.**
  - Most equipment is requested during the first year (or 2) of the grant.
  - **If you use a modular budget format, you may ask for extra module(s) to cover equipment.**

Consultants

- Are experts **outside UW** who provide professional advice or service—can be paid as a lump sum.

- Internal “consultants” are not paid and are referred to as Other significant contributors (OSC) - don’t overload on these!
Supplies

Expendable Supplies

- Identified and justified in the proposal
- Must be clearly associated with that particular project
- Must be expended only for the associated project

Types of Supplies

What kinds of supplies/consumables are required to complete your project?

- Plastic ware
- Gases
- Chemicals/reagents
- Culture Media
- Radioactive reagents
- Animals and per diem (you must have IACUC approval).
- Instrumentation (cost <$5,000, unless otherwise specified by sponsor)

- Computers—Are now ALLOWED!
Supplies budgeted

It may be reasonable to estimate a supply budget of ~$18,000–$20,000/year for each FTE!

Travel

- Do you need to travel to conduct your project, disseminate research progress and results, or network and stay current the field?
- Domestic or international travel (be specific)
  - Identified and justified
  - Includes: transportation, room and board
  - Must be directly related to the project

- Usually ~$2,000 for 1 meeting per individual per year and no more than 2-3 individuals
Subcontracts

- Subcontracts
  - Must provide a substantial programmatic contribution
  - At a minimum require a detailed budget, budget justification, work statement, and institutional endorsement (new requirements per UG forth coming!)

Subrecipient vs Contractor

- Subcontracts
  - Subcontract scope of work is key in completing the objectives of the grant
  - Has responsibility for programmatic decision making
  - Would publish with PI
Contractor

- Vendor (no paperwork required)
- Provides goods and services during normal hours and to many other purchasers
- Operates in a competitive environment
- Provides goods and services that are ancillary to the project
  - For example: running samples with no analysis

Checklist to Determine Subrecipient or Contractor Classification

**OBJECTIVE:** Generally, the determination of the relationship with an entity is verified through the institutional review of the proposal narrative, budget justification, and other related proposal documents, as well as through discussions with key personnel prior to proposal submission. When the relationship remains unclear, this form may provide assistance in making an accurate determination.

**DEFINITIONS FROM UNIFORM GUIDANCE (2 CFR. PART 200):**

**Subrecipient:**
$200.93$ Subrecipient means a non-Federal entity that receives a subaward from a pass-through entity to carry out part of a Federal program; but does not include an individual that is a beneficiary of such program. A subrecipient may also be a recipient of other Federal awards directly from a Federal agency.

**Contractor:**
$200.22$ Contractor means an entity that receives a contract as defined in $200.22$. Contract
$200.22$ Contract means a legal instrument by which a non-Federal entity purchases property or services needed to carry out the project or program of a Federal award.

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Complete sections one and two of the checklist by marking all characteristics that apply to the outside entity. The section with the greatest number of marked characteristics indicates the likely type of relationship the entity will have with the University. On occasion there may be exceptions to the type of relationship indicated by the completed checklist. In these situations, the substance of the relationship should be given greater consideration than the form of agreement between the University and the outside entity. Section 3 should be used to provide documentation on the use of judgment in determining the proper relationship classification.

**NAME OF OUTSIDE ENTITY:**

**SECTION 1 - SUBRECIPIENT**

**Description:** A subaward is for the purpose of carrying out a portion of a Federal award and creates a Federal assistance relationship with the subrecipient. Characteristics which support the classification of the non-Federal entity as a subrecipient include when the non-Federal entity:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Determines who is eligible to receive what Federal assistance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Has its performance measured in relation to whether objectives of a Federal program were met;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Has responsibility for programmatic decision making;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>In accordance with its agreement, uses the Federal funds to carry out a program for a public purpose specified in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[https://www.rsp.wisc.edu/awardmgt/subagmts.html](https://www.rsp.wisc.edu/awardmgt/subagmts.html)
Other Expenses

- Copying & Duplication
  - Only allowable for unusual costs such as: large survey instruments, test, questionnaires, work shop procedures, program brochures
  - Identified and justified

- Other Direct Costs
  - e.g. renovation of space, off campus facility rentals, long distance charges, participant support costs

- Tuition—limit of $12,000 per student
Other Expenses - continued

- What other kinds of expenses might be incurred for your project?
  - Equipment service agreements
  - Human subjects participation costs
  - Specialty software; software license fees
  - Communication expenses if essential for the project.
  - Advertising for recruiting postdoctoral fellows, students etc.
  - Mailing expenses specific and essential to the project.
  - Other project-specific fees

Unallowable Costs

- Alcoholic beverages
- Bad Debt
- Communication Costs
- Donations
- Entertainment Costs
- Housing expenses
- Mail/printing costs (routine)
- Proposal Costs
Budgets should mimic post-award questions

- The requests in the budget need to follow:
  - Reasonable
  - Allocable
  - Allowable
  - Necessary
  - Consistently applied

What does “reasonable” mean?

- A cost may be considered **reasonable** if the nature of the goods or services acquired reflect the action that a prudent person would have taken under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision to incur the cost was made (ie: a car or a van; basic scope or state-of-the art scope?)
What does “allocable mean?"

A cost is allocable to a specific grant if:
- it is incurred solely in order to advance work under the grant;
- if it benefits both the grant and other work of the institution;

What does “allowable mean?"

A cost is allowable if it is reasonable, allocable and conforms to the cost principles and the sponsored agreement AND is not prohibited by law or regulation (eg: Alcohol)
What does “consistently applied” mean?

Grantees must be *consistent* in assigning costs to cost objectives. Although costs may be charged as either direct costs or indirect costs, depending on their benefit to a the project or program, they must be treated *consistently* for all work of the organization under similar circumstances, *regardless of the source of funding*, so as to avoid duplicate charges. (eg: local phone calls or purchasing stamps)

Pre-award Costs

At grantee’s own risk and expense

- Up to 90 days prior to the start date of a competing award if costs:
  - Are necessary to conduct the project, **and**
  - Would be allowable under a potential award without prior approval
  - Greater than 90 days requires prior approval; retroactive approval may be granted
  - No time limit for noncompeting awards. Costs need to be allowable and carefully managed
Types of Budgets

- **PHS 398** older format (detailed)—still in use for large grants and special RFA’s

- **SF424 Research and Research Related (R&R)** - new electronic format for submitting applications via Grants.gov

- Modular budgets <250K/year
- Detailed budgets >250K/year
- Non-federal—follow specific forms and instructions
On, see the flowchart below.

**Flowchart:**
- **Yes**
  - **Use a detailed budget (SF-424 (R&R) Budget Form)**
- **No**
  - Are you applying for an R01, R03, R15, R21, or R34 grant?
    - **Yes**
      - Is the applicant organization based in the United States?
        - **Yes**
          - Use modular budget (PHS 398 Modular Budget Form)
            - [Link](http://grant.nih.gov/grants/funding/phs398/modular.htm)
        - **No**
          - **Use a detailed budget (SF-424 (R&R) Budget Form)**
    - **No**
      - **Use a detailed budget (SF-424 (R&R) Budget Form)**
### Project #2

#### Budget for Entire Proposed Project Period

**Direct Costs Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Initial Budget</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Total Direct Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Salary and fringe benefits of project personnel</td>
<td>144,627</td>
<td>148,966</td>
<td>153,635</td>
<td>158,038</td>
<td>182,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>65,783</td>
<td>65,696</td>
<td>67,667</td>
<td>69,097</td>
<td>71,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Care Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Facilities Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL DIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>213,009</td>
<td>219,398</td>
<td>223,972</td>
<td>232,751</td>
<td>239,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>213,009</td>
<td>219,398</td>
<td>223,972</td>
<td>232,751</td>
<td>239,733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL Only if Fixed Fee is Requested**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Fee Requested</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Justification:* Follow the budget justification instructions exactly. Use continuation pages as needed.

---

### RESEARCH & RELATED BUDGET - SECTION A & B, BUDGET PERIOD 1

**OPE Number:** A04-0929

**Grant Code:** E03E0

**PI:**

**Department:**

**Division:**

**Project Title:**

**Budget Period:**

**Start Date:**

**End Date:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Key Person</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Project Role</th>
<th>Base Salary ($)</th>
<th>% fringe</th>
<th>Total Project Costs ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Total Funds requested for all Senior Key Persons in the attached file: $170,200

**Total Senior Key Personnel:** $170,200

**Additional Senior Key Personnel:**

**B. Other Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Person</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Project Role</th>
<th>Cal. Monthly</th>
<th>Cal. Yearly</th>
<th>% fringe</th>
<th>Total Project Costs ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Post Doctoral Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resident/Clinical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Research Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Medical Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Research Allocates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Research Sciencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number Other Personnel:** $170,200

**Total Other Personnel**

---

**Check Form for Errors**

---

Tools
Detailed Budget Justification

- Key personnel by role and calendar months
- Other personnel by role and calendar months
- Equipment
- Supplies
- Travel
- Animal Costs or Patient Costs
- Tuition
- List and justify ALL

Budget Justification

Personnel:
David Arndt, M.D. PI (3.6 cal months) I will oversee all aspects of the project, including priorities, overall strategies, and data analysis. I will prepare manuscripts and public presentations, and ensure that materials are available to the community in a timely manner.

Hiram Sanchez, MS (4.8 cal months) Mr. Sanchez has experience in C. albicans molecular genetic methods, in vitro and in vivo biofilm formation and susceptibility assays and imaging, matrix cell wall production, collection, and drug sequestration assays (Aims 1, 2, 3)

Robert Zarnowski, PhD (4.8 cal months) Dr. Zarnowski has experience in C. albicans molecular genetics and extensive experience with the biochemical methods needed for cell wall and biofilm matrix analyses (Aims 1, 2, 3)

Fringe Benefit rate: currently 41%

Subcontract:
Aaron Mitchell, PhD, multiple-PI Dr. Mitchell has extensive experience in Candida genetics and biofilm pathogenesis. He will carry out complicated genetic strain constructions, help with episomes, and transcription factor experiments in (Aims 1, 2, 3).

Supplies:
Supplies include disposables, media components, and reagents for biochemical assays.

Travel:
Funds are requested for the PI to attend one meeting per year in order to present findings.

Other expenses:
Includes microscopy, GCMS, NMR, gene expression analysis. In addition, animals, housing, and animal care are included.
Creating a Modular Budget

1. Start with an itemized budget
2. Add for a total-year budgets (eg $1,195,000)
3. Divide total by number of grant years
   ($1,195,000/5 = $239,000)
4. Round by highest $25,000 level (Round to $250K/year)
5. Request same number of modules each year
   (there is an exception for equipment)
6. Subcontract costs may be rounded to nearest
   $1,000
Modular summary

- List all personnel at applicant organization, including names, number of months devoted to project and roles on the project.

- Subcontract total costs are calculated separately and rounded to nearest $1,000. List personnel, number of months devoted to project and roles on the project.

- Budget justification is limited to personnel and equipment.

- Modular budgets are applicable only to R01, R03, R15, R21 and R34 applications.
Reason for Budget Justification

• The Budget Justification
  • Identifies your costs and explains the need for them
  • Answer any questions a reviewer may have about how you calculated your costs
  • Indicates the base salaries and any yearly increases (Should reflect the objectives of the project)

How is the budget used by Reviewers and Program Officials?

• The budget reveals the applicant’s understanding of what it takes to accomplish the proposed research
• However, the budget is not used to assess scientific merit and is reviewed after the scientific merit is assessed
  
RULE 1: Develop a Realistic Budget!

RULE 2: Justify Your Needs!
NIH Reminders

- **Applications requesting ≥ $500,000 DC** in any single year – applicants **must** seek agreement to accept assignment from Institute staff at least six weeks prior to submission. Include written permission in application.

- **Multiple principal investigator R01** is intended for projects that clearly require a “team science” approach. The Multiple PI option should not be used as a means to justify a larger budget request.

- **Well-funded investigators** should consult with Institute staff regarding policies for support of new research in well-funded laboratories (more than 2 funded R01's).

Funded—Budget Cuts??

- Study section may recommend reductions

- Funding institute may reduce budget further and cut years
  - Not appealable
  - Discuss with Program officer if causes hardship
UW ICTR OnCore: OnLine Collaborative Research Environment

UW ICTR OnCore

- OnCore is a centralized clinical research management software program that allows researchers to use one program to manage all components of clinical research while maintaining consistency, data integrity and compliance across the institution.
- There are two versions of OnCore used at UW-Madison; one supported by the Institute for Clinical and Translational Research (ICTR) and one supported by the Paul P. Carbone Comprehensive Cancer Center.
New D-forms

Forms-D Changes

PHS 398 Cover Page Supplement
- New Vertebrate Animals section added:
  - Are animals euthanized? Yes/No
  - If Yes, is method consistent with AVMA guidelines? Yes/No
  - If No to AVMA guidelines, describe method/provide scientific justification
  - "Disclosure Permission Statement" question removed
  - Ability to add Progress Income Information for 10 budget periods (previously 5)
  - Field order and label changes
  - Added updated burden statement and form expiration date
  - Updated form instructions

PHS 398 Modular Budget
- Indirect (F&A) Costs section changed to dynamically add indirect costs rather than providing static fields for four-entries
- Minor label changes
- Added updated burden statement and form expiration date
- Updated form instructions

PHS 398 Research Plan
- New "Data Safety Monitoring Plan" attachment
- New "Authentication of Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources" attachment
- Minor format and label changes
PHS Assignment Request Form

- New, optional form
- Provides structured information to NIH refires staff regarding funding component assignment preference, study section preference, individuals who should not review your application due to conflicts, and scientific areas of expertise needed to review your application
- Complements existing "Cover Letter Attachment" on SF424 (R&R) form
- Added/updated burden statement and form expiration date
- Updated form instructions

PHS Inclusion Enrollment Report

- Combines Planned Enrollment Report and Cumulative Inclusion Enrollment Report forms into a single form
- Questions used to identify type of report:
  - Delayed onset study? Yes/No
  - Enrollment Type? Planned/Cumulative (Actual)
  - Using an Existing Dataset or Resource? Yes/No
  - Enrollment Location? Domestic/Foreign
  - Clinical Trial? Yes/No
  - NIH-Defined Phase II Clinical Trial? Yes/No
- Added/updated burden statement and form expiration date
- Updated form instructions

8. Type of Application

Select the type from the following list of existing definitions for NIH and other PHS agencies. Check only one. This field is required.

- New. Check this option when submitting an application for the first time or in accordance with other submission policies. See NOT-OD-14-074.
- Resubmission. Check this option when submitting a revised (altered or corrected) or amended application. See also the NIH Policy on Resubmission Applications.
- Renewal. An application requesting additional funding for a period subsequent to that provided by a current award. A renewal application competes with all other applications and must be developed as fully as though the applicant is applying for the first time.
- Continuation. For the purposes of NIH and other PHS agencies, the box for Continuation is only used for specific FOAs.
- Revision. For competing revisions and non-competing administrative supplements.

This field also affects how you complete the Federal Identifier. If "Type of Application" is "New", you can leave the Federal Identifier field blank unless otherwise specified in the funding opportunity announcement.

If "Type of Application" is "Renewal", "Revision", or "Resubmission", enter the IC and serial number of the previously assigned application award number (e.g., use CA007654 from 1R01CA087654-01A1).

If Revision, mark appropriate box(es). May select more than one:
1. Increase Award
2. Decrease Award
3. Increase Duration
4. Decrease Duration
5. Other
Biosketches/Roles:

- You may provide a URL to a full list of your published work. This URL must be to a Federal Government website (a .gov suffix). NIH recommends using My Bibliography. Providing a URL to a list of published work is not required, and reviewers are not required to look at the list.

- Project Role:
- Use "Other" if a category is not listed in the pick list.
- If including individuals classified as "Other Significant Contributors (OSCs)," use the “Other” category and indicate “Other Significant Contributor” as the role in the “Other Project Role Category.” OSCs should be listed last after all other senior/key persons have been listed. Consultants cannot be from your own institution.
Revisions to Biographical Sketch

A. Personal Statement added—Experience and qualifications particularly well-suited for your role in the project

B. Contributions to science (limit of 5) rather than list of publications. Emphasize importance to the field, and/or relevance to the application. Limit of 4 publication under each.

**PMCID numbers required - https://publicaccess.nih.gov/**

**New Biosketches started in 2015 – now a 5 page limit**
A. Personal Statement
I have the expertise, leadership, training, expertise and motivation necessary to successfully carry out the proposed research project. I have a broad background in psychology, with specific training and expertise in ethnographic and survey research and secondary data analysis on psychological aspects of drug addiction. My research includes neuropsychological changes associated with addiction. As PI or co-investigator on several university- and NIH-funded grants, I laid the groundwork for the proposed research by developing and effective measures of disability, depression, and other psychosocial factors relevant to the aging substance abuser, and by establishing strong ties with community providers that will make it possible to recruit and track participants over time as documented in the following publications. In addition, I successfully administered the projects (e.g. staffing, research protections, budget), collaborated with other researchers, and produced several peer-reviewed publications from each project. As a result, I have previous experiences. Less away.

B. Positions and Honors

Positions and Employment
1969-2000 Fellow, Division of Intramural Research, National Institute of Drug Abuse, Bethesda, MD
2000-2002 Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Middlebury College, Middlebury, VT
2001- Consultant, Coastal Psychological Services, San Francisco, CA
2002-2005 Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Washington University, St. Louis, MO
2007- Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Washington University, St. Louis, MO

Other Experience and Professional Memberships
1995-: Member, American Psychological Association
1996-: Member, Gerontological Society of America
1998-: Member, American Geriatrics Society
2000-: Associate Editor, Psychology and Aging
2003-: Board of Advisors, Senior Services of Eastern Missouri
2003-05 NIH Peer Review Committee: Psychobiology of Aging, ad hoc reviewer
2007-11 NIH Risk, Adult Addictions Study Section, members

Honors
2003 Outstanding Young Faculty Award, Washington University, St. Louis, MO
2004 Excellence in Teaching, Washington University, St. Louis, MO
2009 Award for Best in Interdisciplinary Ethnography, International Ethnographic Society

C. Contribution to Science
1. My early publications directly addressed the fact that substance abuse is often overlooked in older adults. However, because many older adults were raised during an era of increased drug and alcohol use, there are reasons to believe that this will become an increasing issue as the population ages. These publications found that older adults appear in a variety of primary care settings or seek mental health providers to deal with emerging addiction problems. These publications document this emerging problem but guide primary care providers and geriatric mental health providers to recognize symptoms, assess the nature of the problem and apply the necessary interventions. By providing evidence and simple clinical approaches, this body of work has changed the standards of care for addicted older adults and will continue to provide assistance in relevant medical settings well into the future. I served as the primary investigator or co-investigator in all of these studies.
2. In addition to the contributions described above, with a team of collaborators, I directly documented the effectiveness of various intervention models for older substance abusers and demonstrated the importance of social support networks. These studies emphasized contextual factors in the etiology and maintenance of addictive disorders and the disruptive potential of networks in substance abuse treatment. This body of work also discusses the prevalence of alcohol, amphetamine, and opioid abuse in older adults and how networking approaches can be used to mitigate the effects of these disorders.

3. Methadone maintenance has been used to treat narcotic addicts for many years but I led research that has shown that over the long-term, those in methadone treatment view themselves negatively and they gradually begin to view treatment as an intrusion into normal life. Elderly narcotic users were shown in carefully constructed ethnographic studies to be especially responsive to tailored social support networks that allow them to eventually reduce their maintenance doses and move into other forms of therapy. These studies also demonstrate the policy and commercial implications associated with these findings.
OTHER SUPPORT

ANDES, DAVID
ACTIVE:
R01 AI067703 (PI: Mitchell) 2/15/11 – 1/30/15 1.2 cal months
NIH/NIADD $60,000 subcontract
Genetic Control of C. albicans Biofilm Formation
Proposed studies will extend analysis of C. albicans transcription factor mutants for understanding of biofilm formation through protein interaction, mutant screening, and microarray analysis of target genes.
Role: Co-investigator
R01 A092225 (PI: Palecek) 7/1/2011–6/30/2016 1.0 cal months
NIH/NIADD $16,275
Prevention of C. albicans Biofilms by Beta-Peptide Release from Thin Films
The goal of studies is to develop methods to prevent biofilm infection.
Role: Co-investigator
R01 AI101157-01 (PI: Kwon) 3/1/2013–2/28/2018 1.2 cal months
NIH/NIADD $20,500
Co-Delivery of Antifungal Agents, Toxicity, and Efficacy against Invasive Candidiasis
The goal of these investigations is to develop novel formulations of antifungal agents.
Role: Co-investigator
R01 AI073299 (PI: Andes) 5/15/08–6/30/2018 3.6 cal months
NIH/NIADD $250,000

PENDING
U19 AI108673 (PI: Andes) 03/01/14–02/28/19 1.2 cal months
NIH-NAID (Center Grant) $2,594,302
The goals of the Center are to provide new, broad spectrum antimicrobial agents through a collaborative focus on high value natural product leads produced by under-explored sources of biological diversity.
U19 AI108673 (PI: Andes) 03/01/14–02/28/19 1.2 cal months
NIH-NAID (Core 3) $397,869
Antimicrobial Drug Discovery from Coevolved Symbiotic Communities
This core is designed to delineate the mode of action of novel antimicrobial drug leads so that the compounds can be refined, improved and readied in the long term for clinical use.
T32 AI055397 (PI: Klein) 07/01/13–06/30/18 Mentor/No effort
NIH-NAID
Microbes in Health and Disease
The program focuses on training basic and clinical scientists in understanding the beneficial and harmful roles of microbes related to human health.
Role: Mentor

OVERLAP:
None
New -Rigor and Reproducibility

Rigor and Transparency in Research

To support the highest quality science, public accountability, and social responsibility in the conduct of science, NIH’s Rigor and Transparency efforts are intended to clarify expectations and highlight attention to four areas that may need more explicit attention by applicants and reviewers:

- Scientific premise
- Scientific rigor
- Consideration of relevant biological variables, such as sex
- Authentication of key biological and/or chemical resources
Scientific Premise:

**GOAL:** Ensure that the underlying **scientific foundation** of the project—concepts, previous work, and data (when relevant)—is sound.

- Pertains to the **underlying evidence/data** for the project
- **Address under Significance** (R applications) or **Research plan** (Ks)
- Addition to the review criteria: "Is there a strong scientific premise?"
- Specifically, has the applicant:
  - Provided sufficient justification for the proposed work?
  - Cited appropriate work and/or preliminary data?
  - Appropriately identified strengths and weaknesses in prior work in the field?
  - Proposed to fill a significant gap in the field?
  - OR has the applicant explained why this is not possible?

Scientific Rigor:

**GOAL:** Ensure a strict application of scientific method that supports robust and unbiased design, analysis, interpretation, and reporting of results, and sufficient information for the study to be assessed and reproduced. Give careful consideration to the methods and issues that matter in your field.

- Pertains to the **proposed research**
- **Address under Approach** (R applications) or **Research Plan** (Ks)
- Addition to review criteria: Are there "strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach, as appropriate for the work proposed?"
- Possible considerations, if appropriate for the scientific field and research question, include plans for:
  - determining group sizes
  - analyzing anticipated results
  - reducing bias
  - ensuring independent and blinded measurements
  - improving precision and reducing variability
  - including or excluding research subjects
  - managing missing data
Relevant Biological Variables:

**GOAL:** Ensure that the research accounts for sex (age or gender) and other relevant biological variables in developing research questions and study designs. The ways in which sex and other biological variables need to be accounted for will differ across research questions and fields of study.

- Pertains to the **proposed research**
- Applies to studies in vertebrate animals and/or human subjects
- **Address in Approach** (R applications) or **Research Plan** (Ks)
- Consideration of sex is required in all studies involving human subjects or vertebrate animals (see next slide).
- Specific considerations to assess include:
  - Applies broadly to all biological variables relevant to the research such as sex, age, source, weight, or genetic strain.
  - Has the applicant considered biological variables, such as sex, that are relevant to the experimental design?
  - Will relevant biological variables be controlled or factored into the study design appropriately?

Sex as a Biological Variable:

**Consideration of sex**, included under the umbrella of “Relevant Biological Variables”, is required in all studies involving human subjects or vertebrate animals.

NIH expectations for applicants:

- If little is known about sex differences, the application should include both sexes.
  - Sufficient numbers should be provided to inform the presence or absence of sex differences. Statistically powered comparisons between sexes may not be warranted.
  - Specific hypotheses about sex differences may not be possible.
  - Findings should be reported separately by sex in progress reports and publications.
- If sex differences are known not to exist, a strong justification should be provided if the application proposes to study one sex.
- If sex differences are known, experiments should be designed with appropriate group sizes to detect sex differences.
Plan for Resource Authentication:

**GOAL:** Ensure processes are in place to identify and regularly validate key resources used in their research and avoid unreliable research as a result of misidentified or contaminated resources.

- Researchers are expected to authenticate key biological and/or chemical resources used in their research, to ensure that the resources are genuine.
- New Additional Review Consideration
  - Authentication of Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources: For projects involving key biological and/or chemical resources, reviewers will comment on the brief plans proposed for identifying and ensuring the validity of those resources.
- Rated as acceptable/ unacceptable
- Does not affect criterion scores or overall impact score

---

**Reviewing Rigor and Transparency of Research: RPG Applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan for Resource Authentication:</th>
<th>Applies to which applications?</th>
<th>Where will I find it in the application?</th>
<th>Where do I include it in my critique?</th>
<th>Addition to review criteria</th>
<th>Affect overall impact score?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Premise</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Research Strategy (Significance)</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Is there a strong scientific premise for the project?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Rigor</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Research Strategy (Approach)</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Are there strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of Relevant Biological Variables, Such as Sex</td>
<td>Projects with vertebrate animals and/or human subjects</td>
<td>Research Strategy (Approach)</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Are adequate plans to address relevant biological variables, such as sex, included for studies in vertebrate animals or human subjects?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentication of Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources</td>
<td>Project involving key biological and/or chemical resources</td>
<td>New Attachment</td>
<td>Additional review consideration s</td>
<td>Comment on plans for identifying and ensuring validity of resources.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Related review issues:

- Different research fields may have different best practices for and reach different conclusions about scientific premise and rigor. Assess based on best practices in the field.
- Page limits have not changed.
- Page limits, cost and time are not valid reasons to disregard attention to these issues.
- Investigators address rigor and transparency differently (e.g. in labeled sections vs. throughout the research plan).
- Rigor and transparency considerations apply to R03 (small grant) and R21 (exploratory/developmental) applications.
- **Rigor and reproducibility are also needed in the Progress Reports (RPPRs). Should be reflected in both section B2 and B6.**

Additional resources

- NIH presentation of background and goals of Rigor and Transparency (video) [https://grants.nih.gov/reproducibility/module_1/presentation.html](https://grants.nih.gov/reproducibility/module_1/presentation.html)
- Rigor and transparency do not apply to all applications. See List of Eligible Activity Codes: [https://nih-extramural-intranet.od.nih.gov/d/sites/default/files/RigorActivityCodes-20151006.pdf](https://nih-extramural-intranet.od.nih.gov/d/sites/default/files/RigorActivityCodes-20151006.pdf). Also, certain Funding Opportunity Announcements are exempt from Rigor and Transparency, by request from the ICs.
The new Uniform Guidance aka: UG!

- 2 CFR PART 200—UNIFORM ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS, COST PRINCIPLES, AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS FOR FEDERAL AWARDS

- Effective largely on December 26, 2014

Subawards 200.330-200.332

- Highlights
  - More prescriptive requirements
    - Perform a risk assessment of the subrecipient
    - Add a lengthy list of elements to the subaward
    - Monitor activities of the subrecipient
      - Financial review
      - Programmatic review
  - Must use subrecipient’s negotiated F&A rate or provide a 10% MTDC “de minimis” rate
  - Possibility of delays in issuing subawards
200.413 Direct Costs (c)

Admin & Clerical Salaries

- “The salaries of administrative and clerical staff should *normally be treated as indirect (F&A) costs*. Direct charging of these costs may be appropriate only if all of the following conditions are met:
  1. Administrative or clerical services are **integral** to a project or activity;
  2. Individuals involved can be specifically identified with the project or activity;
  3. Such costs are explicitly included in the budget or have the prior written approval of the Federal awarding agency; and
  4. The costs are not also recovered as indirect costs.”
- PIs may include these costs in proposal budgets now with a strong justification. Approval is **NOT** automatic.
Routing an submitting

UW Requirements for Approval

- Principal Investigator status
- Outside Activity Report completed (Now with FCOI requirements may need to do several times a year!)
- Effort Training and Certification up-to-date
- **Budget/justification/scope of work required in attachments**
- Clearances IRB, animals stem cell etc
WISPER used for Routing

- **WISconsin Proposal & Electronic Routing System**
- The internal electronic routing form to track the approval, routing, submission status and organize proposal data.
- **Must route through DOM (Betty), SMPH (Debbie) and then to RSP for all submissions.**
- For Training or desk references go to: [http://www.rsp.wisc.edu/WISPER/](http://www.rsp.wisc.edu/WISPER/)  
  GO LIVE!
Electronic Grants submission

- Our system internally is CAYUSE which uploads grants to Grants.gov

- Cayuse is a user-friendly, web-based software program that is used to streamline the process for grant submissions to NIH

- For Training—call Betty or RSP website at: http://www.rsp.wisc.edu/cayuse/index.html#CayuseTraining
### Research & Related Other Project Information

1. **Other Project Information**
   - Application Type
   - **Proposed Project Duration**
   - **Funding Program**
   - **Description**
   - **Budget**
   - **Project Title**
   - **P.I. Name**
   - **Institution**
   - **Co-Investigators**
   - **Co-Investigator/Co-Investigator Affiliation**
   - **Project Summary**
   - **Abstract**
   - **Funding Request**
   - **Assessment Criteria**
   - **Research Plan**
   - **Research Plan Summary**
   - **Research Plan Details**
   - **Research Plan Abstract**
   - **Research Plan Budget**
   - **Research Plan Timeline**
   - **Research Plan Summary**
   - **Research Plan Details**
   - **Research Plan Abstract**
   - **Research Plan Budget**
   - **Research Plan Timeline**

### PHS 368 Research Plan

1. **Application Type**
2. **Proposed Project Duration**
3. **Funding Program**
4. **Description**
5. **Budget**
6. **Project Title**
7. **P.I. Name**
8. **Institution**
9. **Co-Investigators**
10. **Co-Investigator/Co-Investigator Affiliation**
11. **Project Summary**
12. **Abstract**
13. **Funding Request**
14. **Assessment Criteria**
15. **Research Plan**
16. **Research Plan Summary**
17. **Research Plan Details**
18. **Research Plan Abstract**
19. **Research Plan Budget**
20. **Research Plan Timeline**
21. **Research Plan Summary**
22. **Research Plan Details**
23. **Research Plan Abstract**
24. **Research Plan Budget**
25. **Research Plan Timeline**
Check the Status of Your Application in NIH Commons

Sample Grants available

My current “mock” grant
Plus complete R01’s, R21’s, K awards and a T32 can be found at:
http://www.medicine.wisc.edu/research/grantwritingsamples
Notice of Award (NoA)

• LEGALLY BINDING DOCUMENT
  • Granted to University
  • Tells you that your grant is funded; contains award data & fiscal information
  • Grant Payment Information
  • Terms and Conditions of award (such as FDP and SNAP allowances)

********************
NOTICE
OF
GRANT
AWARD
********************

Grant Number: 1R01AI073289-01A2
Principal Investigator(s): DAVID R ANDES, MD
Project Title: Antifungal Resistance Mechanism in Biofilm Growing candida albicans
Diane E Barrett
ASSISTANT DEAN
21 N. Park Street
Suite 6401
Madison, WI 53715-1218
Award e-mailed to: NIH@rsp.wisc.edu
Budget Period: 06/15/2008 – 05/31/2009
Project Period: 06/15/2008 – 05/31/2013

Dear Business Official:
The National Institutes of Health hereby awards a grant in the amount of $367,370 (see “Award Calculation” in Section I and “Terms and Conditions” in Section III) to UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN MADISON in support of the above referenced project. This award is pursuant to the authority of 42 USC 241 42 CFR 52 and is subject to the requirements of this statute and regulation and of other referenced, incorporated or attached terms and conditions.

Acceptance of this award including the “Terms and Conditions” is acknowledged by the grantee when funds are drawn down or otherwise obtained from the grant payment system.

Each publication, press release or other document that cites results from NIH grant supported research must include an acknowledgment of NIH grant support and disclaimer such as “The project described was supported by Award Number R01AI073289 from the National Institute Of Allergy And Infectious Diseases. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institute Of Allergy And Infectious Diseases or the National Institutes of Health.”

Award recipients are required to comply with the NIH Public Access Policy. This includes submission to PubMed Central (PMC), upon acceptance for publication, an electronic version of a final peer-reviewed, manuscript resulting from research supported in whole or in part, with direct costs from National Institutes of Health. The author’s final peer-reviewed manuscript is defined as the final version accepted for journal publication, and includes all modifications from the publishing peer review process. For additional information, please visit http://publicaccess.nih.gov/.
Award Calculation (U.S. Dollars)
Federal Direct Costs $250,000
Federal F&A Costs $117,370
Approved Budget $367,370
Federal Share $367,370
TOTAL FEDERAL AWARD AMOUNT $367,370
AMOUNT OF THIS ACTION (FEDERAL SHARE) $367,370

SUMMARY TOTALS FOR ALL YEARS
YR THIS AWARD CUMULATIVE TOTALS
1 $367,370 $367,370
2 $367,370 $367,370
3 $367,370 $367,370
4 $367,370 $367,370
5 $367,370 $367,370

Recommended future year total cost support, subject to the availability of funds and satisfactory progress of the project.

Fiscal Information:
CFDA Number: 93.855
EIN: 1396006492A1
Document Number: RAI073289A
Fiscal Year: 2008
IC CAN 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012
AI 8472364 $367,370 $367,370 $367,370 $367,370 $367,370

Recommended future year total cost support, subject to the availability of funds and satisfactory progress of the project.

SECTION III – TERMS AND CONDITIONS – 1R01AI073289-01A2
This award is based on the application submitted to, and as approved by, NIH on the above-titled project and is subject to the terms and conditions incorporated either directly or by reference in the following:

a. The grant program legislation and program regulation cited in this Notice of Award.

b. Conditions on activities and expenditure of funds in other statutory requirements, such as those included in appropriations acts.
c. 45 CFR Part 74 or 45 CFR Part 92 as applicable.
d. The NIH Grants Policy Statement, including addenda in effect as of the beginning date of the budget period.
e. This award notice, INCLUDING THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CITED BELOW.

(See NIH Home Page at http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/awardconditions.htm for certain references cited above.)

This institution is a signatory to the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) Phase IV Agreement which requires active institutional participation in new or ongoing FDP demonstrations and pilots.

An unobligated balance may be carried over into the next budget period without Grants Management Officer prior approval.

This grant is subject to Streamlined Noncompeting Award Procedures (SNAP).

For more information, see NOT-OD-08-033 and the Public Access website: http://publicaccess.nih.gov/.
Final thoughts on Budgets and Submitting

- Start early/Route in WISPER early
- Read and re-read instructions
- Contact your Administrator ASAP to let them help you
- Ask questions

THANKS for coming!