ICTR Dissemination and Implementation Research Pilot Award

Key Dates and Info	
Funding	• $150,000 maximum (direct costs only) • 18 months
Eligibility	• UW-Madison Faculty or Scientist (must have permanent PI status) • Partnership with clinic or another implementation site
Pre-Submission Session **(required)**	On or before November 4, 2025, 11pm CT View videos via Canvas Registration required, see D&I Pilot Award website
D&I Launchpad Consultation **(required)**	On or before December 2, 2025 Schedule live consult with ICTR D&I team https://ictr.wisc.edu/consultations/dissemination-implementation-di-consultation/
Pre-Submission Resources (optional)	Q&A Session, October 7, 2025, 9am CT, Live via Zoom Registration required, see D&I Pilot Award website
	ICTR Collaborative Network Consult (free!) https://ictr.wisc.edu/consultations/research-and-protocol-development-program-consult-request/
Letter of Intent Due **(required)**	November 4, 2025, 11pm CT Submit via email to Bri Deyo, deyo@wisc.edu
Full Application Due	December 2, 2025, 11pm CT Submit via REDCap link provided upon LOI confirmation
Review Period	December 2025 – February 2026
Notification of Grant Award	March 2026
Earliest Project Start	April 1, 2026
Contact	Bri Deyo deyo@wisc.edu, 608-262-9188
More information via D&I Pilot Award Website	https://ictr.wisc.edu/funding/dissemination-implementation-di-research/ • This RFA • Registration for Pre-Submission Canvas course • Registration for Q&A Session Zoom • Budget and Justification Template • ICTR Resources for Pilot Applicants, Mentors, & Teams • Frequently Asked Questions

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

ICTR programs have a long history of fostering clinical and translational research. These programs center around building capacity in translational science by training the next generation of biomedical, social, and behavioral scientists; providing investigators and clinicians with critical resources including consultations, technology, and data science; and creating novel solutions to disseminate innovations that improve health. Collaborative engagement multiplies the impact of our programs and epitomizes the Wisconsin Idea, where academic findings translate to practices that benefit all our state's communities.

The Dissemination and Implementation (D&I) Research Pilot Award provides support for proposals that aim to effectively implement, disseminate, and scale up evidence-based or evidence-informed interventions or programs into clinical, community, and/or public health practice settings. Strong proposals will identify, develop, test, evaluate and/or refine D&I strategies and evaluate their impact, reach, uptake and sustainability. This award particularly focuses on projects that address a wide range of challenges, communities, populations, and geographic areas using dissemination and implementation methodology.

Highly valuable project elements include (but are not limited to):

- Leveraging robust and clearly defined dissemination and/or implementation methods and theory-informed frameworks
- Addressing critical and emerging health needs, including leading causes of death in Wisconsin
- Addressing social or environmental factors that influence health and wellbeing
- Improving health outcomes across a wide range of challenges, communities, populations, and geographic areas
- Strengthening Wisconsin's health care and public health workforce
- Creating sustainable collaborations between health systems, researchers, and communities
- Propelling research and education innovations into clinical and community practice
- Supporting and strengthening approaches to patient-engaged partnerships in research, especially among those at risk for adverse health outcomes
- Establishing strong and supportive research mentoring relationships that are mutually beneficial

If a proposal's aims do not directly impact health outcomes (such as with a feasibility pilot), then detailed plans for subsequent research that builds directly upon this proposal and may improve health outcomes must be described.

This award is intended to support projects that will further an investigator's career path. Successful proposals will clearly describe how the pilot data collected as a part of this award will be used to seek further, external, peer-reviewed funding in support of a research career trajectory. Early career investigators with limited PI experience are strongly encouraged to submit proposals as the Contact PI, in partnership with senior investigators who have relevant research methods expertise to serve as Co-Investigators, collaborators or mentors.

FUNDING

Contingency

Support of projects funded by this RFA is contingent upon continued grant support from the Wisconsin Partnership Program (WPP) for pilot awards administered by the UW Institute for Clinical and Translational Research (ICTR).

Non-Discrimination

ICTR follows UW-Madison and WPP nondiscrimination policies and guidelines when funding pilot awards. These policies may be found online:

- Comprehensive resource for UW-Madison non-discrimination laws, policies, and procedures https://compliance.wisc.edu/eo-complaint/
- WPP Non-Discrimination Guidelines, https://wpp.med.wisc.edu/grant-funding/resources-policies/non-discrimination-guidelines/

ELIGIBILITY OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

- The Contact PI must hold a UW-Madison faculty appointment or Scientist title with permanent PI status
  - Must have an appointment greater than or equal to 0.5 FTE at UW-Madison (the award funding account will be managed through the Contact PI's UW-Madison department)
  - Faculty with any title, in any track (clinical health sciences, clinician teacher, tenure, research professor, teaching professor or clinical adjunct) are eligible
  - Individuals in the Scientist title series must provide: 1) confirmation of authorization of Permanent PI Status from the Vice Chancellor for Research; 2) Letters of Support from a faculty supervisor and department chair or dean, and 3) proposed academic trajectory, including evidence of previous external funding and research independence
- Individuals who do not meet the criteria for Contact PI may serve as Co-Investigators or other Key Personnel
- Proposals that include multiple PIs (MPIs) must designate one person as the Contact PI, who must hold a UW-Madison faculty appointment
- A Contact PI may not:
  - Have been the Contact PI on an ICTR Pilot Award funded by the Wisconsin Partnership Program (WPP) after April 1, 2025
  - Be the Contact PI or MPI on any currently active ICTR grant award (serving as co-investigator or other Key Personnel is not exclusionary)

RESOURCES

Available Online

https://ictr.wisc.edu/funding/dissemination-implementation-di-research/

- *Registration for the required Pre-Submission Canvas course*. A link will guide you to registration in Canvas. You must watch both videos and complete the attestation statement in the quiz to complete this requirement.
- *Registration for the optional Q&A Session Zoom session*. A link will guide you to registration in Zoom. Attending this session is optional but may be helpful as you assemble your application.
- *Budget and Justification Template*. Use of this template is required for your full application.
- *ICTR Resources for Pilot Applicants, Mentors, & Teams*. A downloadable PDF that contains descriptions of various offerings that ICTR provides to all research teams but are especially useful at the pilot stage. Initial consults are free, but some ongoing services may require budgetary consideration. Consult early!
- *Frequently Asked Questions*. A downloadable PDF that contains the answers to common questions about this funding mechanism

Available in this RFA

- The "Key Dates and Info" table on page 1 summarizes deadlines, contact information, and important pre-submission requirements and opportunities
- The "References and Resources" table at the end of this document provides links to the resources that are referenced throughout this RFA

APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION

Please review and follow these instructions carefully.

Optional

Question & Answer Session, October 7, 2025, 9am CT, Live via Zoom

Applicants are also encouraged to attend a live Zoom session with the ICTR Pilot Awards Team to discuss any questions you may have about your application before you get started. All questions about the application and review process are welcome. The format is fully open to your questions and discussion, but pre-registration is required. See the registration link on the RFA website: https://ictr.wisc.edu/funding/dissemination-implementation-di-research/

Pre-Submission ICTR Collaborative Network Consult

Applicants are strongly encouraged to complete a free consultation with the ICTR Collaborative Network any time before submitting their full pilot award application. This consultation is optional during the application period, but funded applicants who did not consult prior to their award start date will be required to do so upon receiving their award. Contact: protocoldevelopment@ictr.wisc.edu

Required

Pre-Submission Session, Canvas Course

This course is available on-demand and contains two video recordings that are essential to the competitiveness of your pilot award proposal. **Applicants are required to view this video prior to submitting an LOI.** Faculty mentors, co-Investigators, research staff, and other collaborators are not required to view the video but are encouraged to do so.

One video provides guidance for the development of a complete, responsive, and high-quality application. The other video introduces community engaged research, including best practices and

logistical pearls to strengthen the approach section of submissions. Completion of the course is recorded by Canvas in the form of an attestation in the Quizzes tab of the course, so there is no need to submit additional documentation to confirm compliance with this requirement.

Pre-Submission Consultation, ICTR D&I Launchpad
ICTR D&I Launchpad consultations are required of the contact PI to strengthen methodology and promote collaboration among likeminded scientists on campus, as well as community partners throughout Wisconsin. **Applicants are required to complete this live consultation on or before submitting a full application.** Schedule your free consultation here: https://ictr.wisc.edu/consultations/dissemination-implementation-di-consultation/

Letter of Intent (LOI)
An LOI must be submitted via email (see the Key Dates and Info Table on Page 1). Once the LOI is received, the applicant will receive an e-mail acknowledgment. The LOI serves to determine eligibility and to assist in the identification of appropriate peer reviewers. The LOI will **not** be used for final review or ranking and is not included in the final application packet provided to the reviewers.

After LOIs are reviewed, eligibility will be confirmed, and the applicant will be invited via email to submit a full application. A link to the online application submission form will be provided in that confirmation email.

LOI Format: PDF, 1 page maximum, single spaced, 0.75" minimum margins, Arial 11-point font

Required Information, in this order:

- Title of proposed pilot research project
- Contact PI and any Co-PIs (as needed): Name, UW school/college and department/division, campus address, telephone number, and email
- Co-Investigators (as needed): Name, UW school/college and department/division, and specific expected contributions to the design and conduct of the proposed research
- A list of *anticipated* contributors, collaborators, implementation sites, organizations, community partners, consultants, and/or invested groups, including brief descriptions of their relevant expertise and expected involvement in the proposed research
- A brief summary of the proposal, including specific aims, general research design and methods
- A brief description of the knowledge gap(s) this proposal intends to address
- Describe any relevant collaborative partnerships (see *Full Application* > *Narrative* > *Investigators* section for full definitions):
    - New Junior + Senior Investigator collaboration
    - UW-Madison + Marshfield Clinic collaboration
    - Interdisciplinary collaboration

Full Application
Eligible applicants who have submitted an LOI and viewed the Pre-Submission Session in Canvas before the deadline (see the Key Dates and Info Table on Page 1) will receive confirmation via email that contains a link to the online application submission form. All application materials are submitted via this online form in REDCap.

Online Form Fields
The REDCap form contains fields that collect academic (required) and demographic (optional) information about the applicant. The applicant completing the form should enter their information in the "Contact PI Information" section and then add information for any Co-Principal Investigators in the "Co-

PI Information" section, as needed. Prepare to provide identifying information for all Co-PIs including ORCID, eRA Commons ID, and institutional mailing address.

A complete application must include all the following components (*Scientific Abstract* through *Letters of Support*), combined into one PDF file and submitted via the online submission form. The Budget and Justification are submitted as a separate file.

Full Application Format: 1 PDF, single spaced, 0.75" minimum margins, Arial 11-point font. Page or word limits are specified for each section. If no page or word limit is specified, there is no such limit. Please note that combining PDF documents that contain electronic signatures may cause the loss of the certificate for those signatures; this is acceptable for the purpose of this application. Signed documents with electronic signature certificates intact may be requested at a later time if the proposal is funded.

Scientific Abstract

500 words, maximum. Provide a concise description of the proposed research written for scientific audiences. The Scientific Abstract must include:

- Scientific rationale supporting the proposed research
- Specific hypothesis or hypotheses to be generated or tested
- Research aim(s)
- Research design
- Proposed D&I Science framework
- How the project uniquely leverages D&I methods to reach communities or populations experiencing inadequate health outcomes in our state
- Brief description of how this project will inform your next grant, including potential funders who have identified your research topic as a funding priority

Community Abstract

500 words, maximum. Provide a description of the proposed research written specifically for a layperson audience. This abstract should not be a reiteration of the Scientific Abstract but should tell a story that addresses the importance of this research, whose lives will be impacted, and how. A video on writing for community reviewers is available here (https://videos.med.wisc.edu/videos/8470).

The Community Abstract could include topics such as:

- Description of the implementation site(s) and communities or populations you are trying to reach
- Magnitude of the health issue for the impacted community
  - How many individuals are affected?
  - What is the scope of this issue in Wisconsin?
  - How are the costs of health care impacted?
- How and when the project will directly help the impacted community, including anticipated future work that will be informed by this project
- Knowledge gap
  - What gap will the proposed research address?
  - What will the anticipated project results show that is not already known?
- Community collaborators
  - How were implementation sites, community members, contributors, or partners identified and invited to collaborate?
  - How were they involved in developing the research question?
  - How will they be involved in the research; what roles will they play?

  - How will the project ensure the involvement of community collaborators is meaningful?
  - What evidence indicates that research addressing the health problem is sought by potential end-users?
  - If implementing or disseminating an intervention, describe the role of potential adopters
- Potential long-term impact of this program of research
  - How might this project improve health outcomes in Wisconsin across a wide range of challenges, communities, populations and geographic areas?
  - How will this program of research disseminate and/or implement new or existing findings into improvements in clinical practice and/or community health?
  - How might this research inform or impact organizational or public policies?

Narrative

7 pages, maximum. Page limit includes any tables or figures included for the listed sections. Narrative must include all following sections (a through j) in this order:

a) Specific Aims
   - Include clearly defined and measurable objectives

b) Background and Significance
   - Include a strong statement regarding the ways the project will directly impact those who will benefit from the project, how that will happen, and how it will improve the health of those living in our state
   - Describe the involvement of the patients, community, and/or other impacted entities in developing the dissemination and/or implementation plan
   - Describe feedback from community partners and/or the study population (e.g., patient advocacy groups, community clinicians, health care administrators) on the proposed work. If no such feedback has been collected, clearly describe why.
   - Resources:
     i. Wisconsin Department of Health Services Leading Causes of Death Dashboard: https://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/stats/deaths/causes.htm
     ii. PCORI's Stakeholders: https://www.pcori.org/about/about-pcori/our-programs/engagement/public-and-patient-engagement/pcoris-stakeholders

c) Innovation
   - Describe how this project addresses the specific aims and/or advances the science of Dissemination and Implementation in a new way
   - Describe any solutions to disseminating or implementing current research knowledge into clinical practices or policies that this project creates

d) Approach
   - Describe the specific implementation site for this pilot, including justification for its selection
   - Any preliminary research and experience relevant to this proposal
   - Describe study design, including study procedures and data collection
   - Describe qualitative and/or quantitative methodologies
   - If proposing new methodology, describe how this project improves upon current methods
   - Describe potential difficulties and limitations, and how to overcome or mitigate them
   - Describe how research plans are justified for the protection of human research participants from research-related risks
   - Describe how this proposal improves health outcomes across a wide range of challenges, communities, populations, and geographic areas in Wisconsin, either in the current proposal or in subsequent work stemming from this pilot

- Resources:
  i. ICTR Research and Protocol Development Program free consult: https://ictr.wisc.edu/consultations/research-and-protocol-development-program-consult-request/
  ii. ICTR Dissemination and Implementation Launchpad free consult: https://ictr.wisc.edu/consultations/dissemination-implementation-di-consultation/
  iii. NIH Pilot Studies, Common Uses and Misuses: https://www.nccih.nih.gov/grants/pilot-studies-common-uses-and-misuses

e) Data Analysis Plan
- Describe how qualitative and quantitative data, as applicable will be evaluated and interpreted
- Describe how data evaluation methods and techniques were selected
- Describe sample size justification, if applicable
- Resources:
  i. General Statistical Analysis Plan (SAP) Guidance: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4552232
  ii. SAP Guidance for Clinical Trials: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29260229
  iii. ICTR Biomedical Data Science free consult: https://ictr.wisc.edu/consultations/biomedical-data-science-program-consultation/
  iv. UW Data Science Institute free consult: https://dsi.wisc.edu/services/data-science-services
  v. NIH Strategic Plan for Data Science: https://datascience.nih.gov/nih-strategic-plan-data-science

f) Investigators
- Describe how the Investigators, research team, and collaborators are especially suited to conduct this project
- If the Contact PI is an early-career investigator, describe experience, training, and mentorship related to the proposed work
- If the Contact PI is an established investigator, describe accomplishments (i.e. publications, external funding, sustained practice, and/or policy change) related to the proposed work
- Describe previous experience working directly with the community organizations, patients, and/or other impacted entities involved in this application
- Describe whether/how this proposal involves any of these collaborative partnerships:
  i. New Junior - Senior Investigator collaboration – The project involves a new partnership between an early career investigator and a senior investigator. A new partnership refers to two investigators who have not co-authored a manuscript.
  ii. UW-Madison - Marshfield collaboration – The project involves collaboration between a UW-Madison investigator and a Marshfield Clinic Research Institute (MCRI) investigator.
  iii. Interdisciplinary collaboration – The project involves collaboration among investigators from different UW-Madison schools or colleges. For the purposes of this grant program, an interdisciplinary collaboration is not among different departments within the same UW-Madison school or college.

g) Environment
- Describe the scientific environment in which the work will be done
- Describe how this environment will contribute to the success of the project
- Describe how the project will benefit from the unique features of the environment

h) Collaboration Plan
- Describe how community partners and/or study populations (e.g., patient advocacy groups, community clinicians, health care administrators) will be involved in the proposed work, and what roles individuals or groups will play
- Describe planned processes for team decision-making and scientific direction, including that between the Investigators (as applicable)
- Describe the planned distribution of responsibilities and work processes, including protocol development, data collection, administrative responsibilities, project management, data analysis, and dissemination activities
- Describe planned collaboration activities, including communications and information-sharing methods, and meeting frequency and modality
- Using the Steps Model, identify the research team's current level of engagement with the contributing community partners and/or study populations (e.g., patient advocacy groups, community clinicians, health care administrators), and the level of engagement anticipated through the end of the proposed work
- Resources:
    i. Steps Model: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5449250
    ii. ICTR Collaboration Planning services: https://ictr.wisc.edu/service/collaboration-planning/
    iii. Team Science Community Toolkit: https://www.teamscience.net
    iv. ICTR Community Engagement free consult: https://ictr.wisc.edu/consultations/health-research-consultation/

i) Dissemination Plan
- Describe the audience(s) to which results from this project will be disseminated (e.g. patients, community partners, and/or other specific clinical practices, advocacy groups or policy makers)
- Describe how and when the results from this project will reach the specified audience(s)
- Identify the dissemination scale (local, national, international)
- Resource:
    i. ICTR Dissemination and Implementation Launchpad free consult: https://ictr.wisc.edu/research-resources/dissemination-implementation-launchpad/di-research-consultation/

j) Future Considerations
- Funding. **An expectation of this program is that the research team must have plans to apply for external, peer-reviewed funding**. What is the next step in this research project's trajectory and what are your plans for acquiring subsequent funding
- Examples of other future considerations might include, but are not limited to:
    i. Research Implications – What is the five-year trajectory envisioned for this pilot research to move toward impact? What is the potential for generalizability of this work? What kinds of collaborators and/or community partners will need to be engaged for future work?
    ii. Policy Implications – If applicable, address how this research might inform or impact organizational or public policies.

Citations

List all citations referenced. No specific formatting style is required (e.g., APA or MLA), however, the style must be consistent within the list and full citations must be referenced for all relevant and cited literature. Include the Digital Object Identifier (DOI), where applicable.

Impact Statement

Respond to one of the three following questions regarding the health impact that is best aligned with your research question:

1. Identify and justify specific metrics that will be used to assess the impacts of this research on health outcomes and/or the effects of this research on specific, well-established determinants of health.
    - Resources:
        i. UW-Madison Neighborhood Health Partnerships Program, Placing Social Determinants of Health in Context: https://nhp.wisc.edu/sdoh
        ii. US DHHS Social Determinants of Health: https://health.gov/healthypeople/priority-areas/social-determinants-health
        iii. NIH Conceptualization of Social Determinants of Health: https://www.ninr.nih.gov/research/nih-sdohrcc#tabs2
2. If specific metrics will not be measured in the proposed study, describe the metrics that will be used in future work stemming from this pilot to identify the effects of such work on health outcomes or specific, well-established determinants of health.
3. If specific health outcomes cannot be measured directly, describe other possible impacts of this pilot, including the dissemination or implementation of any permanent new or revised structures, policies, or processes in the delivery of health care services or community health programs that are the result of this project and/or collaboration.

Timeline

Describe how all proposed activities are feasible within the grant period. Include a table that shows all project activities and milestones, examples may include (but are not limited to):

- IRB application
- Development of project tools/data collection forms
- Participant recruitment
- Data collection, extraction/abstraction, validation, analysis
- Dissemination activities: presentations of results, manuscript preparation, etc.

Regulatory Approvals

Indicate whether the project involves contact with human research subjects, and/or biologic samples. If so, describe what existing or planned regulatory reviews will be required (e.g., Institutional Review Board, Certificate of Confidentiality, biological/laboratory safety certifications, etc.). **A specific IRB submission and documentation of regulatory approval for this pilot project must be obtained, using the same project title as listed in the official ICTR Notice of Grant Award. Amending an IRB approval from another existing project is NOT sufficient.**

While regulatory approval is not required at the time of application, and ICTR support and project start dates may begin as early as April 1, 2026, the funding account will not be opened until a letter of Approval or Exemption is issued from the relevant Institutional Review Board.

Biosketches
Must be submitted for all Investigators and all other Key Personnel listed in the Budget, using the current NIH template.

- Resource: NIH Biosketch Template: https://grants.nih.gov/grants/forms/biosketch.htm

Other Support
Must be submitted for all Investigators listed in the Budget, using the current NIH template. Must include a statement of overlap between previously funded projects and the proposed research.

- Resource: NIH Other Support Template: https://grants.nih.gov/grants/forms/othersupport.htm

Letters of Support
A signed (ink or electronic) letter of commitment from the Contact PI's department chair or dean is required. The letter must include a description of departmental commitment to post-award administrative and fiscal management support.

Signed (ink or electronic) letters of support from all collaborators listed in the budget must be included. All letters should specify the following:

- The support they are offering the project and how they intend to use the results of the project towards practice, program, and/or policy change
- Their specific, meaningful role in the project
- Justification of any budgetary agreements
- For partnerships with established UW-Madison programs, a LOS from the director or administrator of that program must be submitted. These letters should further include an explanation of the program's capacity and expertise to fulfill their described role.
- For letters from implementation sites and/or community organizations, a LOS should further describe:
    - Organization leadership approval for the specific research activities that will be performed by the organization and/or people representing the organization
    - Organization leadership approval for the payment (specify whether payment will be provided to the organization or an individual)
    - Specify whether the signing individuals are supporting the project on behalf of themselves or on behalf of an organization
    - Must be signed or co-signed by organization leadership

Contact PIs in a Scientist track must include confirmation of permanent PI authorization from the Vice Chancellor for Research and a letter of support from the mentor and/or department chair or dean expressing strong support for this independence and an outline of the PI's proposed academic trajectory.

Budget and Justification
Budgets must be submitted using the template provided and include all expenses that directly support the proposed project. Total budgets may not exceed the cap listed for the selected track. Budgets are subject to review and approval by ICTR and WPP.

Indirect and/or administrative costs are not allowed.

Budget sections must include:

- Personnel

- Include the percent effort to be committed to the project for all UW-Madison contributors, with fringe where applicable, including Co-Investigators, mentors, collaborators, staff, and students
    i. Investigator salary is only allowed for work related to this award, with justification
    ii. Graduate student and post-doctoral associate stipends are allowed for work related to the pilot, with justification. Include any proposed tuition remission in the budget, per UW-Madison policy
    iii. List all UW-Madison contributors, even those with in-kind or zero-dollar contributions
    iv. The utilization of staff (i.e. research coordinators or project coordinators) is highly recommended; salary support for administrative staff is prohibited

- Collaborators and/or Contractual Costs
    - Include payments to individuals and/or organizations that are outside of UW-Madison, and could be in the form of stipends or fees for services
    - Compensation to community and/or patient partners must be commensurate with their contributions to the proposed work
- Research Participant Costs
    - Include any costs associated with paying research participants for their participation, and/or food, travel, parking or other items provided directly to participants for the purpose of contributing to this research
    - All research participant incentives must be approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB)
- Supplies
    - Laboratory and computing supplies, research equipment, office supplies, etc., that are essential, solely for the study, and not otherwise available may be requested
    - Large equipment expenditures (> $5,000) are not allowed
- Travel
    - Include any travel, made by UW-Madison personnel, which is necessary for the conduct of the research
- Other Expenses
    - List any expenses which do not fit into any of the previous categories
- Community Collaborators/Partners
    - List all non-UW-Madison collaborators, including the organization they represent, and their role on the project
    - Specify the organization and/or person within the organization that will be responsible for receiving the listed funds (as much as possible, payments should be made directly to organizations, rather than to individuals)
- Project/Performance Site: Primary Location
    - List the address where the study activities will be taking place
    - Additional rows may be added, as needed
- Budget Justification
    - Include cost basis information for all listed expenses (e.g. hourly rates x hours expected, cost per unit of purchase x units expected, etc)
    - Create the list of justifications in the same order as the Detailed Budget Table
    - All proposed spending must be fully justified in this section, including the specific role the expense fulfils for the project

It is strongly encouraged that a fiscal administrator from the Contact PI's home department review the budget and justification prior to submission.

Please refer to UW-Madison and WPP budget policies, especially allowable and unallowable expenses, payments to personnel, payments to research participants, and supplanting. Funded projects must adhere to WPP policies. Please note that WPP policies may be more prescriptive than UW-Madison policies. Key budget resources:

- UW-Madison Allowable costs: https://rsp.wisc.edu/awardmgt/directcosts.cfm
- UW-Madison Tuition Remission: https://rsp.wisc.edu/policies/tuitionremission_faq.cfm
- WPP Resources & Policies: https://wpp.med.wisc.edu/grant-funding/resources-policies
- WPP Allowable and Unallowable Grant Expenses: https://wpp.med.wisc.edu/grant-funding/resources-policies/grant-expenses-policy
- WPP Supplanting Policy: https://wpp.med.wisc.edu/grant-funding/resources-policies/non-supplanting-policy/

REVIEW CRITERIA

Each full application will be evaluated by at least 2 independent peer reviewers using the full Simplified Framework for NIH Peer Review. Merit will be determined by averaging the Overall Impact scores from each independent peer reviewer. Meritorious applications will then be evaluated for Overall Impact by an ICTR Scientific Review Group (SRG). Meritorious proposals will then be reviewed, scored, and ranked by an External Community Review Group (ECRG). The review criteria for each of these reviews is described below.

All applicants, regardless of funding decision, will receive a summary statement and aggregate comments, explaining the rationale for the scores following completion of the entire review process.

Scientific Review

The Simplified Framework for NIH Peer Review Criteria retains the five regulatory criteria (Significance, Investigators, Innovation, Approach, Environment) but reorganizes them into three factors; two will receive numerical criterion scores and one will be evaluated for sufficiency. All three factors will be considered in arriving at the Overall Impact score. The reframing of the criteria serves to focus reviewers on three central questions reviewers should be evaluating: How important is the proposed research, how rigorous and feasible are the methods, and whether the investigators and institution have the expertise/resources necessary to carry out the project.

- Resource: Simplifying Review of Research Project Grant Applications | NIH https://grants.nih.gov/policy-and-compliance/policy-topics/peer-review/simplifying-review

Overall Impact

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, in consideration of the following review criteria. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

Factor 1: Importance of the Research, scored (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)

- Significance
  - Evaluate the importance of the proposed research in the context of current scientific challenges and opportunities, either for advancing knowledge within the field, or more broadly. Assess whether the application addresses an important gap in knowledge in the

field, would solve a critical problem, or create a valuable conceptual or technical advance.
    - Evaluate the rationale for undertaking the study, the rigor of the scientific background for the work (e.g., prior literature and/or preliminary data) and whether the scientific background justifies the proposed study.
- Innovation
    - Evaluate the extent to which innovation influences the importance of undertaking the proposed research. Note that while technical or conceptual innovation can influence the importance of the proposed research, a project that is not applying novel concepts or approaches may be of critical importance for the field.
    - Evaluate whether the proposed work applies novel concepts, methods or technologies or uses existing concepts, methods, technologies in novel ways, to enhance the overall impact of the project.

Factor 2: Rigor and Feasibility, scored (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)

- Approach
    - Evaluate the scientific quality of the proposed work. Evaluate the likelihood that compelling, reproducible findings will result (rigor) and assess whether the proposed studies can be done well and within the timeframes proposed (feasibility).
- Rigor
    - Evaluate the potential to produce unbiased, reproducible, robust data.
    - Evaluate the rigor of experimental design and whether appropriate controls are in place.
    - Evaluate whether the sample size is sufficient and well-justified.
    - Assess the quality of the plans for analysis, interpretation, and reporting of results.
    - Evaluate whether the investigators presented adequate plans to address relevant biological variables, such as sex or age, in the design, analysis, and reporting.
    - For applications involving human subjects or vertebrate animals, also evaluate:
        i. the rigor of the intervention or study manipulation (if applicable to the study design).
        ii. whether outcome variables are justified.
        iii. whether the results will be generalizable or, in the case of a rare disease/special group, relevant to the particular subgroup.
        iv. whether the sample is appropriate and sufficiently diverse to address the proposed question(s).
    - For applications involving human subjects, including clinical trials, assess the adequacy of inclusion plans as appropriate for the scientific goals of the research. Considerations of appropriateness may include disease/condition/behavior incidence, prevalence, or population burden, population representation, and/or current state of the science.
- Feasibility
    - Evaluate whether the proposed approach is sound and achievable, including plans to address problems or new challenges that emerge in the work. For proposed studies in which feasibility may be less certain, evaluate whether the uncertainty is balanced by the potential for major advances.
    - For applications involving human subjects, including clinical trials, evaluate the adequacy and feasibility of the plan to recruit and retain an appropriately diverse population of participants. Additionally, evaluate the likelihood of successfully achieving the proposed enrollment based on age, racial, ethnic, and sex/gender categories.

- For clinical trial applications, evaluate whether the study timeline and milestones are feasible.

Factor 3: Expertise and Resources, evaluated as either sufficient for the proposed research or not

- Investigator(s)
  - Evaluate whether the investigator(s) have demonstrated background, training, and expertise, as appropriate for their career stage, to conduct the proposed work. For Multiple Principal Investigator (MPI) applications, assess the quality of the leadership plan to facilitate coordination and collaboration.
- Environment
  - Evaluate whether the institutional resources are appropriate to ensure the successful execution of the proposed work.
  - Evaluate whether the budget and the requested period of support are fully justified and reasonable in relation to the proposed research

Community Review

Applications meeting a high threshold of scientific merit are forwarded for review by the UW ICTR External Community Review Group (ECRG). The ECRG includes representatives from agencies and organizations throughout the state, who are committed to improving health for the people of Wisconsin. The ECRG ensures that a strong community voice is represented in UW ICTR funding decisions and makes final funding recommendations to ICTR leadership.

Proposals are scored using a 1-9 rating scale, based on two main criteria:

1. Potential to impact health outcomes of the people and communities engaged in the proposed project
2. Meaningful engagement of community and/or patient partners

AWARD ADMINISTRATION

All applicants receiving ICTR pilot awards must adhere to the following administrative requirements:

- PIs must attend in the following learning opportunities. Co-Investigators, Collaborators, and Research team members are strongly encouraged to participate:
  - ICTR Collaborative Network Consult. To be completed in the first month of the award if not done prior to submitting the final application. This consultation is a free, 1:1 meeting for Investigators to optimize protocols, with the potential for tailored access additional ICTR services that might be suitable for their specific project.
    https://ictr.wisc.edu/program/research-and-protocol-development-program-rapd/
  - Collaboration Planning Workshop. An individualized, live consultation to engage your team in thinking through ways you will work together, proactively addressing areas that most frequently cause conflict in teams, including authorship, communications, and project management.
    https://ictr.wisc.edu/team-science/team-science-collaboration-planning
  - Design for Dissemination Workshop. An individualized, live workshop to help you plan for dissemination in the next phase of your research, which many have found beneficial when designing the next grant.
    https://ictr.wisc.edu/program/dissemination-implementation-launchpad/

  - Intellectual Property Workshop. Intellectual Property Workshop. An on-demand course available in Canvas, which is designed to introduce Investigators and study teams to UW policies and requirements around intellectual property and copyright policies.
    https://research.wisc.edu/intellectual-property/ip-policies-and-forms
    https://wpp.med.wisc.edu/grant-funding/resources-policies/ip-agreement
- Pre-award survey. The Contact PI must complete a survey that allows ICTR to collect information on awardees' experiences and perspectives as an investigator, departmental fiscal contacts, and project-specific regulatory considerations.
- Regulatory approvals. Copies of all human subjects approval documents (including updates) must be forwarded to ICTR award administrators.
- Quarterly Progress Reports are required throughout the award period, beginning at the award start date, and are submitted by the Contact PI. These will be collected via online survey, and will address accomplishments to date, spending projections, and impacts of research resources and training provided by ICTR (e.g. Collaboration Planning, Design for Dissemination training, etc.).
- Timely account closure. Within 60 days of the project end date, submit any final invoices along with a written description of accomplishments, including conference abstracts, publications, grant applications, and plans to further develop the project.
- Alumni Surveys will be requested from the Contact PI annually for 5 years beyond the end date of the project. These will be collected via online survey, and address evaluation metrics of populations/communities involved in the research, grants and dissemination products, and impact on rural health and inequities. Follow up interviews may be requested.
- PIs must adhere to the NIH Public Access Policy and obtain PMCID numbers for every publication utilizing pilot data.
- PIs must acknowledge Pilot award funders in NIH biosketches and all publications, presentations, and dissemination activities, and notify ICTR of such publication submissions/acceptances, as well as any grant submissions/awards, using data generated from the pilot project. Specific instructions will be provided in the Notice of Grant Award Letter.

References and Resources	
NIH Resources	Biosketch Template: https://grants.nih.gov/grants/forms/biosketch.htm Definition of a Clinical Trial: https://grants.nih.gov/policy/clinical-trials/definition.htm Other Support Template: https://grants.nih.gov/grants/forms/othersupport.htm Pilot Studies, Common Uses and Misuses: https://www.nccih.nih.gov/grants/pilot-studies-common-uses-and-misuses Simplifying Review of Research Project Grant Applications: https://grants.nih.gov/policy-and-compliance/policy-topics/peer-review/simplifying-review Strategic Plan for Data Science: https://datascience.nih.gov/nih-strategic-plan-data-science
ICTR Services and Consultation Opportunities	All Available Opportunities: https://ictr.wisc.edu/consultations/ Biomedical Data Science Program: https://ictr.wisc.edu/consultations/biomedical-data-science-program-consultation/ Collaboration Planning: https://ictr.wisc.edu/service/collaboration-planning/ Community Engagement: https://ictr.wisc.edu/consultations/health-research-consultation/ Dissemination and Implementation Launchpad: https://ictr.wisc.edu/consultations/dissemination-implementation-di-consultation/ Protocol Development: https://ictr.wisc.edu/consultations/research-and-protocol-development-program-consult-request/ Team Science: https://ictr.wisc.edu/program/team-science/
UW-Madison Resources and Policies	Abstract Writing: https://videos.med.wisc.edu/videos/8470 Allowable Costs: https://rsp.wisc.edu/awardmgt/directcosts.cfm Intellectual Property: https://policy.wisc.edu/library/UW-4008 Intellectual Property Policies and Forms: https://research.wisc.edu/intellectual-property/ip-policies-and-forms Non-discrimination: https://compliance.wisc.edu/eo-complaint/ Tuition Remission: https://rsp.wisc.edu/policies/tuitionremission_faq.cfm

References and Resources	
WPP Resources and Policies	All Resources: https://wpp.med.wisc.edu/grant-funding/resources-policies Allowable and Unallowable Grant Expenses: https://wpp.med.wisc.edu/grant-funding/resources-policies/grant-expenses-policy Intellectual Property Agreement: https://wpp.med.wisc.edu/grant-funding/resources-policies/ip-agreement Non-discrimination: https://wpp.med.wisc.edu/grant-funding/resources-policies/non-discrimination-guidelines/ Supplanting Policy: https://wpp.med.wisc.edu/grant-funding/resources-policies/non-supplanting-policy/
Data Science and Analysis Planning	General SAP Guidance: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4552232 SAP for Clinical Trials: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29260229
Collaboration Planning and Team Science	Steps Model: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5449250 Team Science Community Toolkit: https://www.teamscience.net
Other Relevant Resources	AHRQ: https://www.ahrq.gov PCORI: https://www.pcori.org PCORI Stakeholders: https://www.pcori.org/about/about-pcori/our-programs/engagement/public-and-patient-engagement/pcoris-stakeholders WI DHS, Leading Causes of Death: https://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/stats/deaths/causes.htm
Social Determinants of Health	NIH-wide Social Determinants of Health Research Coordinating Committee: https://www.ninr.nih.gov/research/nih-sdohrcc#tabs2 US DHHS Social Determinants of Health: https://health.gov/healthypeople/priority-areas/social-determinants-health UW-Madison Neighborhood Health Partnerships Program, Placing Social Determinants of Health in Context: https://nhp.wisc.edu/sdoh