



Research Community Update

From the Office of Sponsored Programs

OCTOBER 18, 2016

The Research Community Update informs campus administrators about research-related topics of interest and importance. Staff in the Office of Sponsored Programs are here to help you with navigating the changing and challenging world of research administration.

To unsubscribe, or to request that someone be added to this newsletter distribution list, please contact Ron Fleischmann, Associate Director of Pre-Award Administration (fleischm@uwm.edu).

This issue features:

- [New Policy Eliminates Most Appendix Materials for NIH/AHRQ/NIOSH Applications](#);
- [Top Ten Reasons to Send Your Proposal to OSP Well Before the Deadline](#);
- [UW System Applied Research Grant: Full Applications Due via WISPER by January 24, 2017](#);
- [Upcoming Change to WISPER](#); and
- [The \\$5.00 Question This Week is Worth \\$20.00!](#)

NEW POLICY ELIMINATES MOST APPENDIX MATERIALS FOR NIH/AHRQ/NIOSH APPLICATIONS

By Dave Harris

Policy Notice [NOT-OD-16-129](#) announced plans to eliminate most appendix materials for applications submitted to the National Institutes of Health (NIH), Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) **for due dates on or after January 25, 2017**.

What is allowable for appendix materials after January 25, 2017?

The only allowable appendix materials for NIH, AHRQ, and NIOSH applications will be:

For all applications:

- Blank informed consent/assent forms;
- Blank surveys, questionnaires, and data collection instruments; and
- Items specified in a Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA). If appendix materials are required in the FOA, review criteria for that FOA will address those materials and applications submitted without those appendix materials will be considered incomplete and will not be reviewed.

For applications proposing clinical trials (unless the FOA provides other instructions for these materials):

- Clinical trial protocols; and
- Investigator's brochure from Investigational New Drug (IND), as appropriate.

What happens to the appendix materials in peer review?

All information submitted with an application except the cover letter, assignment request form, and appendix information are assembled into a single application image for funding consideration. The different sections within the application image are specified in the application instructions and correspond to the standard review criteria. Consequently:

- All information required for the peer review process must be contained within those designated sections of the application image, unless the FOA specifies otherwise.
- Information that expands upon or complements information provided in any section of the application—even if it is not required for the review—is not allowed in the appendix unless it is listed in the allowed appendix materials ([NOT-OD-11-080](#)).
- Unless the FOA *requires* that certain information be included in the appendix, failure of reviewers to address appendix materials in their reviews is not an acceptable basis for an appeal of initial peer review ([NOT-OD-11-064](#)).

What is the rationale for these changes?

The NIH, AHRQ, and NIOSH strive to ensure fairness in peer review for all grant applicants by specifying the types and amount of application material that are accepted for peer review. At the same time, these agencies appreciate both the

need for applications to provide sufficient information to allow for an informed, expert review process and the importance of limiting the burden on peer reviewers.

Elimination of most appendix materials is intended to correct inequities in the peer review process that can arise from submission of inappropriate or excessive appendix materials by some applicants and consideration of appendix materials in peer review by some, but not all, reviewers.

What are the consequences for submitting unallowable appendix materials?

Applications will be withdrawn and not reviewed if they are submitted with appendix materials that are not specifically listed in Notice [NOT-OD-16-129](#) or the FOA as allowed or required. Application instructions will be updated by November 25, 2016 to reflect this change.

Questions related to this new policy? Please contact the [Pre-Award Specialist](#) assigned to your division or department.

TOP TEN REASONS TO SEND YOUR PROPOSAL TO OSP WELL BEFORE THE DEADLINE

By Ron Fleischmann, Michelle Schoenecker, Ann Shiras, and Kari Whittenberger-Keith

We in OSP are always asked, “When do you want our proposal for X deadline?” Well, **we always recommend at least five business days before the deadline**, but our staff works hard to accommodate our PI’s timelines. We get it—being a PI is never easy, and there always is lots of uncertainty when it comes time to submit a proposal.

But we also recognize that the first step in getting an award is showing up to the party—the Proposal Review Party. You cannot receive an award if the proposal is submitted late. So, in celebration of the Proposal Review Party, we turn to our retired, dear friend, David Letterman, for a fun Top Ten List: *The Top Ten Reasons to Send Proposals to OSP Well Before the Deadline*.

10. **We Are Human—Part I.** We are all human and we all make mistakes. Sometimes OSP receives proposal files that are not complete, have the wrong attachments, or include a budget that does not total. Providing OSP sufficient time for review will ensure your proposal is as accurate as possible.
9. **We Are Human—Part II.** Many of our campus colleagues do not know what it takes for OSP to actually submit a proposal to a sponsor. Did you send us a Grants.gov application via e-mail? Great—but we need time to download and save the file, check the package, resave the file, and enter in our login credentials. Sometimes, we cannot type fast enough if the proposal comes to us with only minutes to the deadline!
8. **Some of Us Thrive Under Pressure—But Many of Us Do Not!** As you get closer to the deadline, the pressure increases: the clock is ticking away in the corner of your computer, your caffeine and chocolate supply is running low, and the chance of uploading the wrong attachment or the wrong budget data rapidly increases as you close in on the deadline. But it doesn’t have to be this way—submit early and beat the clock and the pressure!
7. **Be Nice To Your Fellow Researchers.** We must strike a delicate balance in serving our constituents: there are many PIs, but there are only a few us in OSP. We are outnumbered! Thus, we sometimes have to choose between submitting a proposal, processing a new award, or processing a continuation. And while the pressing deadline always wins, it can have an impact on your colleagues by delaying award set-up, adding funds, or resolving problems for your fellow researchers.
6. **Three Words: Sponsor Server Failure.** It happens! Remember Hurricane Sandy and the devastation it left on the East Coast? There was a sponsor here in Wisconsin that outsourced its online proposal submission process to a company in New Jersey—when the storm hit, there was no way to submit proposals. That left OSP in the lurch—would the sponsor accept a proposal after the deadline? This situation highlights two issues: (1) you never know where the IT infrastructure is located that supports electronic submissions, and (2) you never know if the sponsor will allow you to submit a late proposal, even if there were factors outside of your control!
5. **Three More Words: UWM Power Failure.** We are pretty “lucky” here in Wisconsin—we get four seasons. We get the “pleasure” of winter blizzards, fall wind storms, severe spring storms, and summer heat waves that overwhelm the local power grid (which happened to us the day NSF CAREER proposals were due this year). Each of these has the potential to knock out our power—and our ability to submit proposals at the last minute. While some sponsors allow us to submit after the fact with a justification, there is NO guarantee that a sponsor will accept our late proposal.
4. **Computers Are Ruthless—Part I.** Sponsors have very fickle electronic proposal submission systems, and the interaction between our computers and the sponsors’ systems sometimes can be a recipe for disaster:

Grants.gov: "I see you are using Adobe 11.2.34-AA."
UWM Computer: "Why yes, I am."
Grants.gov: "Too bad. You need to be using 11.2.34-AB."
UWM Computer: "Oh no. Oh well, I'll just crash and let my PI figure how to submit the proposal to OSP in the next four minutes."

While we are not certain if this is the actual conversation that occurs between these systems, it sure seems like it.

3. **Last-Minute Scheduling Can Be A Nightmare.** Does your proposal require a hard-copy signature from OSP in the next 34 minutes? Because OSP staff are multi-tasking professionals, we might be in meetings or working with other PIs under a deadline, or unexpectedly out sick or on vacation. If you need a hard-copy signature for your proposal, please submit the documents early so that we can coordinate with time to spare.
2. **We Are Human—Part III.** OSP staff are indeed truly human—we do not yet have the ability to work 24/7. Some sponsors schedule deadlines at odd hours, and while we try to accommodate submissions after 5:00pm, it becomes very difficult with competing demands for work, family care, and other important commitments. We do not want to miss a deadline because staff were not available outside of regular office hours to submit a proposal.
1. **Computers Are Ruthless—Part II.** Do you remember the "good old days," when a simple postmark indicated whether a proposal was submitted to a sponsor "on time?" And the date of that postmark was flexible, depending on how nice you were to the postal clerk? Those days are gone. Today the submission date/time is based on a computer server—and servers don't care if you are nice to them! Servers only care about the date and time and will mark your proposal "late" if you are off by a millisecond. Oh, and the sponsor's servers only care about themselves: the date and time on THEIR SERVERS is what matters when it comes to your proposal arriving "on time"—not the date and time on your computer, our computer, the clock on the wall, your watch, or on your phone.

UW SYSTEM APPLIED RESEARCH GRANT: FULL APPLICATIONS DUE VIA WISPER BY JANUARY 24, 2017

The Request for Proposals for the [2017-2018 UW System Applied Research Grant \(ARG\) Program](#) has been released. The required Intent to Submit e-mail is due to UW System by December 18, 2016. **Full proposal materials are due via [WISPER](#) by Monday, January 24, 2017.** The Office of Sponsored Programs will coordinate the institutional signature on the required cover page as well as the submission of the full proposals to UW System.

A [WISPER Quick Guide](#) is available to assist principal investigators with initiating and routing a WISPER record. Please contact the [Pre-Award Specialist](#) assigned to your division or department with questions.

UPCOMING CHANGE TO WISPER

Effective October 25, WISPER will limit the selection of "Project Roles" available under "Additional Senior Personnel" in the General Tab. Currently, users have the choice of nine Project Role options. As of October 25, users will only have three options: Co-Investigator, Key Person, or Principal Investigator. A screen shot of the revisions appears below.

Yes No Use of vertebrate animals?
 Yes No the purchase or use of technology-related services, supplies, and/or equipment?
 Yes No potential environmental impacts which require review under the Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act?
 Yes No action involving space, remodel, or construction?
 Yes No funding primarily dedicated to building, renovations, or equipment?

Enter Protocol Certification Details Here

Additional Senior Personnel

Name	Project Role	Outside Activities Report Submitted	Effort Requirements Met
KOBER, KATHERINE ANN	<input type="text" value="Principal Investigator"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-Investigator Key Person Principal Investigator 	No	No

Proposed Budget

Direct Costs: 100000.00 Cost Sharing Included:
 F & A Costs: 49,500.00 Cost Sharing Amount:
 Total Costs: 149,500.00
 F & A Rate: 49.5%
 On Campus: Yes No Cost Share Comments:
 Outgoing Sub-agreement(s): Yes No

Keywords

Keyword:

Print

[Sign the Record](#)

[Route to Another Person](#)

[My Worklist](#)

[Search Page](#)

[Save](#)

Why the change to WISPER? The change is being instituted to [better align with the descriptions of project personnel in a proposal with federal regulations, state laws, and UW System and UWM policy governing compliance-related requirements](#) at each stage of the pre- and post-award process. Additionally, the change is designed to reduce the number of personnel listed in this section of WISPER to only to those considered key to the project.

Questions? Please contact the [Pre-Award Specialist](#) assigned to your division or department.

THE \$5.00 QUESTION THIS WEEK IS WORTH \$20.00!

In the spirit of professional development, during the Fall 2016 semester OSP will present a question or scenario to Research Community Update subscribers about various aspects of research administration (proposal development, pre-award, compliance, and post-award). Subscribers will have one week from the date of publication to submit an answer, and the subscriber(s) with the best answer(s) will receive a \$5.00 gift card to The UWM Grind*! OSP will publish the best responses along with the subscriber's name, department/division, and response in an upcoming edition of the Research Community Update. Our prize jackpot will accumulate if we have no winners. Since we have not had a winner for three editions of the Research Community Update, our current prize is a \$20.00 gift card to the UWM Grind!

THIS WEEK'S QUESTION:

A PI has an NSF award ending in 30 days. The award included a \$20,000 budget for participant support cost and the PI has only spent \$11,000 in this budget category. What options are available to the PI?

PREVIOUS WEEK'S QUESTION AND RESPONSE:

Q: Dr. X is budgeted to devote 50% of her Total Effort to an NIH project and is paid from the grant at that rate. She puts in 30 hours a week on the project, but also spends 20 hours a week on her teaching and administrative responsibilities. Because 30 hours is 75% of a 40-hour week, on her effort statement she enters 75% as her Certified Effort on the NIH project.

Is that correct? Why or why not?

A: No. Total professional effort equals all hours worked, which includes all the time Dr. X spends on teaching, service, and research activities. The calculation of total professional effort is not based on a 40 hour week. Therefore, Dr. X's correct certification is 30 hours on the NIH project / 50 hours of total professional effort, or 60%.

**No state funds are used to purchase recognition items. Staff from the Office of Research and the Office of Sponsored Programs are ineligible.*