**Application Deadline: February 25, 2019**

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

The DOM Education Committee awards grants for educational innovation and scholarship within our department. We are seeking applications from DOM faculty and trainees requesting **up to $20,000** for educational projects that support the DOM education strategic plan priorities and goals**.** These funds cannot be used for faculty salary support. The maximum travel allocation is $3,000 which can be divided between grant participants.

Applicants eligible for funds

* Department of Medicine Faculty (SMPH faculty member with a primary DOM appointment)
* Trainees with an identified DOM Faculty Sponsor

Strategic Plan priorities and goals for funding consideration

**Priority 1:** Promote a Community of Educators devoted to supporting and developing key skills in teaching, program development, scholarship and career development.

**Priority 2:** Enhance the practice skills of all learners and educators with curricula applicable to all clinical settings. Curricula key to the strategic plan:

* QI, patient safety
* Transitions of care
* High value care
* Population health
* Inter-professional team work
* Self-directed learning
* Health and wellness

How applications are reviewed:

The Chair of the DOM Education Committee will assign applications for review by regular and/or ad hoc members of the Education Committee using the rubric included below. The reviewer will present the application to the committee who will vote to determine whether to fund the project and at what amount. The number of applications funded will depend on the score and the availability of funds.

Expectations if funded

Funds will be available on **July 1**, **2019** and must be expended by **June 30, 2020.** Any funds not encumbered by **May 31, 2020** will be returned to the Department. The Education Committee expects the PI to present results at the Department of Medicine Education Day, Department of Medicine Grand Rounds, or a similar venue.

Examples of previously funded projects

Medical student focused:

* A RCT of on-line interactive learning vs recorded lectures (Tom Shiffler)
* Medical student intern preparation course with trainee educators (Sara Johnson)

Resident focused:

* Six-month curriculum to promote empathic skills among interns (Mariah Quinn)
* Bias workshop for residents (Christine Kolehmainen)
* Assessing resident geriatric competencies using clinical simulation (Alexis Eastman)
* Development of a Web-Based Platform for Blended Learning in a Resident-as-Educator Curriculum (Jess Tischendorf and Sara Johnson)
* Resident Directed Curriculum for Bedside Ultrasonography (Katherine Fell and Tim Rowe)
* Development of a Blended Interprofessional Ambulatory Care Curriculum (Madelyn Alvarez)

Fellowship focused:

* Centralizing DOM quality improvement training for fellowships (Laura Maursetter)
* Preventing Endoscopy-Related Injuries Among Gastroenterology Fellows: A Train the Trainers the Program (Kerry Austin and Sumona Saha)
* Empathy Training During Cardiovascular Fellowship (Miguel Leal)

Faculty focused:

* A coaching program for faculty development in presentation skills (Jeremy Smith)
* Faculty can ‘Break the Bias Habit’ too! (Christine Kolehmainen)

Interprofessional and across training levels:

* Quality improvement training in cancer (Ryan Mattison)
* On-line portal for competency-based evaluation and training (Mihai Teodorescu)

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION**

Materials requested for submission

1. Cover page (form included below)
2. A summary **limited to 5 pages** (excluding literature references):

Purpose of request with detailed plans and time lines identified

Impact on learners

Sustainability of the intervention over time if applicable

Anticipated outcomes

A specific plan for dissemination of findings from this work

How the project aligns with the strategic priorities

1. A one-year budget including description and justification for costs (form and example included below). Note that your division administrator should provide input and a signature stating their approval
2. The principal investigator’s CV or biosketch. For trainee applications, the faculty sponsor’s CV or biosketch should also be included.
3. A letter of recommendation from someone familiar with how this project fits with the investigator’s career path (e.g., Division Head). For trainees, a letter of support from the Department of Medicine faculty sponsor fulfills this requirement.

**Send an e-copy to: Kathy Woytych at** [**kw2@medicine.wisc.edu**](mailto:kw2@medicine.wisc.edu)

**COVER PAGE**

**Date submitted:**

**Investigator:**

**Investigator’s Title:**

**Co-Investigator/Faculty Sponsor (if applicable):**

**Co-Investigator’s/Faculty Sponsor’s Title:**

**Primary Department/Division:**

**UDDS#:**

**Title of Project:**

**Total budget amount requested:**

**BUDGET SUMMARY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Category of expense including description and justification\* | Cost |
| Consultants (student hourly for example) |  |
| Equipment |  |
| Supplies |  |
| Travel (limited to $3000) |  |
| Other expenses |  |
| **Total Amount Requested** |  |
| Other Division Contributions (in-kind & other) |  |
| **Total Project Costs** |  |

\*Review budget with your Division Administrator. Have Division Administrator sign their approval below

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**EXAMPLE BUDGET SUMMARY FROM PREVIOUS GRANT**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Category of expense including description and justification | Cost |
| Consultants (student hourly for example)  Graduate student hourly for data coding and quantitative and qualitative analysis, assistance with manuscript preparation ($12/hr, 6 hr/wk for 52 weeks =$3744) +4% fringe = $3893.76  Undergraduate student hourly for transcription of hand-written narratives = ($10/hr x 1hr/wk for 52 weeks = $520) +4% fringe = 540.80  Standardized patient ($30/hr, 1/3 hour x 3 per intern) - $840 | $5,295.36 |
| Equipment |  |
| Supplies  Snacks for workshop participants for 3-4 hour long sessions (assorted snacks and drinks from Costco) ($5/intern x 28 intersn x 4 sessions = $560) | $560.00 |
| Travel (limited to $3000)  Present preliminary project results at 2016 SGIM Annual Meeting, May 11-15 (registration $700, flight $425, hotel $200night x 3 nights, food $50/day x 3 days) | $1,875.00 |
| Other expenses  Instrument fees-Maslach Burnout Inventory ($50 for manual and $100 for 84 uses) =$160  Poster printing (UW Media Solutions = $10.25 +$147 = $157.25) | $317.25 |
| **Total Amount Requested** | $8,047.61 |
| Other Division Contributions (in-kind & other)  Protected time for faculty who participate in teaching the course  OSCE observation and feedback, interaction with learners in classroom setting  Curricular administrative support and data management  Department Box space for OSCEs | $0 |
| Total Project Costs | $8,047.61 |

# SCORING RUBRIC FOR GRANT APPLICATION

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality of submission:** | | | | **Score out of 5:** | | |
| Unclear explanation and organization. Purpose and focus and not apparent on first review | Organized, but poorly explained. | Organized well, but explanations are superficial without depth | Written, explained and organized well, but justification for funding is not clear | | | Written, explained and organized in a way that justifies why this should be funded |
| **Alignment**: | | | | **Score out of 5:** | | |
| Does not address the strategic plan priorities |  | Addresses a strategic plan priority, but with a loose association | Clearly addresses at least one of the strategic plan priorities | | | Clearly addresses multiple strategic plan priorities |
| **Curriculum Quality: (if applicable)** | | | | | **Score out of 5:** | |
| Does not address components of new curricula  (Reference: Kern DE, et al; Curriculum Development for Medical Education) | Addresses 1 or 2 components of new curricula | Addresses 2 or 3 components of new curricula | Addresses 3 or 4 components of new curricula | | | Describes all important components of new curricula: needs assessment; goals/objectives; teaching strategies; implementation; evaluation/feedback |
| **Impact:** | | | | **Score out of 5:** | | |
| No direct impact on learners | Affects one level of learner (student, resident, fellow, faculty) | Affects two levels of learners | Affects three levels of learners | | | Affects more than three levels of learners |
| **Dissemination:** | | | | **Score out of 5:** | | |
| No plan for dissemination delineated | Vague plan for dissemination (for example, meeting submission mentioned, but no dates of meeting nor submission deadlines provided) | Clear plan for dissemination, but plan is limited in scope and could be broader | Develops a clear plan for local or regional dissemination (with identified dates of submission befitting project timeline, presentation of importance to DOM) | | | Develops a clear plan for national dissemination (with dates of submission befitting project timeline, presentation of importance to DOM) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Budget:** | | | | **Score out of 5:** | |
| All costs are not included and/or either under- or over-estimated | Costs are generalized and not well justified | Costs are well documented, but are either under- or over-estimated | Costs are complete, correct, but justification is questionable | | Costs are clearly documented with appropriate level of detail; justification is easy to follow |
| **Innovation:** | | | | **Score out of 5:** | |
| No review of current literature | General reference to current state of research in the area | Specific review of the literature, but may not be well connected to project focus | Discusses overview on present state of literature in the area with specific documentation of where review was conducted. | | Discusses overview on present state of literature in the area with specific documentation of where review was conducted. Based on that overview, justifies why this project is needed |
| No discussion about potential to change practice in the field |  | General reference to potential change in practice |  | | Outlines how findings could have potential to change practice in the field |
| **Feasibility** | | | | **Score out of 5:** | |
| Timeline unrealistic, (ambitious time line or project continues beyond the budgeted time) | Timeline requires a potential adjustment of duties that is not documented/ not likely to occur | Well-developed timeline, but a disconnect between time required and expected outcome | Well-developed, but ambitious timeline that could be accomplished by a devoted PI. | | Outlines clear timeline; project can realistically be completed in time allotted |
| Outcomes described do not fit with project description |  | Outcomes and project description are somewhat connected |  | | Outcomes are realistic based on description of the project |
| No description of qualifications to complete project or no mentorship |  | Some description of qualifications to complete project, or possible mentorship |  | | Detailed description of qualifications to complete project, or ensured mentorship |
| **Sustainability beyond grant funding (if applicable; scored as no=0 / yes=1)** | | | | **Score out of 1:** | |
| No discussion of future funding when is it apparent this will be needed |  |  |  | | Provides a general idea of where additional funding will come from |
|  | | **Total Score out of 35, 36, 40 or 41:** | | | |