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INTRODUCTION

The Mountain West Clinical & Translational Research – Infrastructure Network (CTR-IN) Program’s Professional Development (PD) Core, successfully concluded its Grant Writing Workshop (GWW) themed, “Preparing and Revising Competitive Clinical & Translational Research Grants” on November 16, 2022. The GWW was held in-person at the JW Marriott Resort - Las Vegas, NV as a Pre-Annual Meeting Activity, its webpage can be accessed with the following link: [https://ctrin.unlv.edu/gww-fall-2022/](https://ctrin.unlv.edu/gww-fall-2022/). The Objectives and Speakers & Consultants below:

**OBJECTIVES:**

1. Prepare current & potential Principal Investigators (PIs, current and unsuccessful Pilot Grant Awardees) from Mountain West CTR-IN affiliated universities to write grants focused on clinical translational research, or community engagement research.
2. Inform the PIs on NIH updates on grant applications and new FOAs.

**SPEAKERS, CONSULTANTS, & MENTORS:**

**Ruben Dagda, PhD**
Associate Director, Professional Development (PD) Core, MW CTR-IN
Chair, Grant Writing Workshops (GWW), PD Core, MW CTR-IN
Chair, Advance to Funding (ATF) Program, PD Core, MW CTR-IN
Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacology, University of Nevada Reno

**Larissa Myaskovsky, PhD, FAST**
Director, Professional Development (PD) Core, MW CTR-IN
Professor, University of New Mexico, School of Medicine
Director, Ambassador Translational Research in Progress (ATRIP) Program, MW CTR-IN
Director, Center for Healthcare Equity in Kidney Disease (CHEK-D), UNM HSC

**Lauren Lessard, PhD, MPH**
Core Faculty, Biostatistics and Epidemiology Research Development (BERD) Core, MW CTR-IN
Associate Professor, Institute for Circumpolar Health Studies
University of Alaska, Anchorage

**Juli Petereit, PhD**
Co-Director, Biostatistics, Epidemiology, & Research Design (BERD) Core, MW CTR-IN
Director of Bioinformatics, University of Nevada, Reno

**Akshay Sood, MD, MPH**
Associate Director - Mentoring Unit, PD Core, MW CTR-IN
Professor and Miners' Colfax Medical Center Endowed Chair in Mining-Related Lung Diseases
Medical Director, Miners' Wellness Tele-ECHO Clinic
Assistant Dean, Mentoring & Faculty Retention, UNM SOM Office of Faculty Affairs & Career Development

**Tony Ward, PhD**
Director, Community Engagement & Outreach (CEO) Core, MW CTR-IN
Professor and Chair, University of Montana, School of Public and Community Health Sciences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>PARTICIPANT TYPE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE N (%)</th>
<th>AGREE N (%)</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE N (%)</th>
<th>DISAGREE N (%)</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE N (%)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>AVERAGE (STRONGLY AGREE = 5)</th>
<th>OVERALL AVERAGE (STRONGLY AGREE = 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The objectives of the workshop were fulfilled.</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>6 (60%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I gained a good understanding of the concepts &amp; skills in grant writing after attending the workshop.</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The instructional materials (PowerPoint &amp; Interactive Sessions) were relevant to the objectives of the workshop.</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I was satisfied with the quality of the review &amp; feedback I received from mentors &amp; MW CTR-IN Leadership.</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>2 (33.33%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (33.33%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (33.33%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Overall, my goals for taking this workshop were met.</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (16.67%)</td>
<td>2 (33.33%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## POST-WORKSHOP SURVEY RESULTS (CONTINUED)

### CONFIDENCE MEASURES

(0-100 Scale with 0 = Cannot do at all; 100 = Highly certainly can do)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PARTICIPANT TYPE</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>POST</th>
<th>OVERALL POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparing a Specific Aims page</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59.22</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>85.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing a competitive Significance section</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.11</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>73.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing a competitive Innovation section</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>72.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing a solid Research Approach section</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61.56</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>67.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>76.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging your community in research</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>70.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>76.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting the most appropriate study section(s) for your grant</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56.44</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>78.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to and approaching your Program Official</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.11</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>79.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting appropriate biostatistical analysis of your preliminary data and/or developing an appropriate analysis plan for your application (power analysis, Bayesian and non-Bayesian methods, analysis of intra-and inter- population variance, pre-/post- tests in CTR grant applications)</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54.11</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>74.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUDITOR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

- What was the most helpful aspects of the workshop?

  • The one on one sections with the Core members was extremely useful. Also, the new grant book is a definite plus.

  • The lectures are relevant, but some of them could be shorter.

  • Writing and fine tuning the specific aim is really helpful. Understanding how to present the statistical approach is also great. I learned so much from the workshop even though I was auditing it.

  • The speakers were highly knowledgeable. The resources provided are excellent.

  • Specific tips and strategies introduced

  • writing different components of specific aims

  • one to one session providing feedback Mentors were available to discuss to guide and support each participant’s questions and needs

  • The very up to date information about changes in grant submission to NIH

  • The step by step and sentence by sentence concrete instructions on how to develop a NIH grant proposal from Dr. Sood.

  • All mentors shared a lot of valuable suggestions and comments for my proposed the research work

  • sa and funnel

  • The series of lectures was helpful. It is like a checklist during writing a proposal; however, the instructors' experiences and stories enriched the lectures. The lecture about the biostatistician was helpful to understand their prospects like how I can approach their consultation with my experimental plan. (The idea for spreadsheet was great!)

  • Certain PowerPoints that provided clear information and directions for successful grant writing.

  • It helped me to improve my knowledge of the crucial paragraphs and wording necessary when submitting an NIH application. I learned a little about all the sections and what information I should add. Also, it gave me the confidence to apply.

  • It helped me to improve my knowledge of the crucial paragraphs and wording necessary when submitting an NIH application. I learned a little about all the sections and what information I should add. Also, it gave me the confidence to apply.
- What was the least helpful aspects of the workshop?

• Not enough time for breaks, it might be better to split into a 2 day workshop to keep everyone energized.

• The peer review was good, but not that comprehensive. It would be more helpful if there is a follow-up session that can meet virtually later.

• N/A

• Some participants were not engaged and took time to encourage them to participate/talk

• It was a great “starting point” for those who have no NIH R01 grant writing experience.

• I wish that I could fully utilize the break session and hand-on activities, especially during the lunch/work session. Also, it will be appreciated if the learners are able to receive the outline of the PowerPoint presentations prior to the workshop (although I really appreciate all instructors work hard to prepare for this workshop and reviewed all assignments).

• The overall workshop and the breakout sessions. The workshop was set up like a “bull session” with rapid reporting of what is needed without any application (or writing) to practice the shared information. A bull session limits the engagement of the participants, which is pivotal in a successful workshop. It felt as if the emphasis was not on the participants but the speakers/moderators. The breakout sessions focused on what was accessible through MW referral services with limited, and potentially to rapid, discussion and writing of the specific elements. Clearly, there was a preferred template to write the elements of a grant, probably based on the included book. However, the absence of actual writing and reflection only resulted in a highly compressed and convoluted presentation of the template, its utility, and significance in writing a fundable grant. As a result, anything learnt resulted from prior knowledge and a timely review of the book after the workshop--self-learning.

• The small groups. We didn't have enough time to discuss the feedback. Also, the small groups with the specialists. Most of the participants didn't move tables at a specific time, which affected the interactions between specialists and other participants.

• The small groups. We didn't have enough time to discuss the feedback. Also, the small groups with the specialists. Most of the participants didn't move tables at a specific time, which affected the interactions between specialists and other participants.