Message from the Director

The Office of Sponsored Programs has had a very busy three months. The Fall season has kept us busy with proposals, awards, and faculty changes. Since July 1, we have submitted 196 proposals for $83 million (including 65 USDA NIFA proposals). Also, since July 1, we have processed 103 awards for $17.5 million. A few faculty members have left UTIA, and we are working on transferring grants to their new institutions or requesting key personnel substitutions from the award sponsors. We are welcoming some incoming faculty and working on transferring awards to UTIA.

Kathy Dalton celebrated the birth of her second grandson, Michael Henry Dalton, born in Tucson on September 3. Kathy and her husband, Mike, were able to help them welcome the baby home.

We look forward to welcoming a new Dean for AgResearch soon and are enjoying meeting with the candidates and hearing their visions for UTIA.

Don’t forget to check out the Compliance Corner for information regarding UT’s new online format for Outside Interests Disclosure forms. Remember if you have questions regarding compliance issues you may always reach out to Jane Burns the Institute’s Compliance Officer.

Please let us know if you have information you would like us to share in future issues of our newsletter. We are happy to include your contributions.

Thank You,

Debbie Hampstead
Dr. Justin Rhinehart

Dr. Rhinehart is an Associate Professor and Extension Beef Cattle Specialist in the Department of Animal Science. He received his B.S. in Agriculture and Extension Education from the University of Tennessee, M.S. in Reproductive Physiology from the University of Kentucky, and Ph.D. in Reproductive Physiology from West Virginia University. Before coming to the University of Tennessee, he worked as an Assistant Professor and Extension Beef Cattle Specialist for Mississippi State University.

His objective as an Extension Specialist is to provide research-based management tools and technologies that help beef cattle producers improve the reproductive efficiency of their cow herds; thereby enhancing their economic viability, quality of life, and generational sustainability. To accomplish that objective, he provides training and updates to UT Extension Agents to help them stay prepared for troubleshooting, educating, and consulting on reproductive management issues with the beef cattle producers in their communities. Dr. Rhinehart also assimilates the concerns and issues from beef cattle producers across the state to keep research faculty informed about information that is needed, but that has not yet been addressed through basic or translational research. He also participates in the translation of new research findings in reproductive physiology and endocrinology through field trials and demonstrations.

Dr. Rhinehart co-coordinates the Tennessee Beef Heifer Development Center and Reproductive Management Training Program (providing certification programs in artificial insemination and reproductive ultrasonography). He also coordinates, and provides reproductive management curriculum for, the Tennessee Master Beef Producer and Advanced Master Beef Producer certification classes. During the time Dr. Rhinehart has coordinated these programs, UT Extension Agents have issued more than 14,000 certifications and generated $2.9 million in fee-based and contractual revenue.

Dr. Sherry Cox

Dr. Sherry Cox is a Professor in the Department of Biomedical and Diagnostic Sciences. She received her BS in Chemistry from Lincoln Memorial University, MS in Toxicology from East Tennessee State University and PhD in Pharmacology from the University of Tennessee.

Dr. Cox is the director of the UTCVM Pharmacology Clinical Service Laboratory. Many academicians want to know what your ‘niche’ is and hers is “analytical pharmacology”. Her philosophy in the Pharmacology laboratory has always been if we have the equipment and the expertise we will try to develop an analytical method for the clinician or investigator. She has developed a service that is recognized nationally and internationally for both its quality and expertise in analytical methodology for clinical research. The laboratory develops and validates assays intended to support both intramural and extramural research providing collaboration between the UT College of Veterinary Medicine, the pharmaceutical industry, other universities, zoos and aquariums. Central to all of our research is the analysis of drugs in biological samples from animals.
Dr. Debra Miller is a Professor with a joint appointment in the Department of Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries and the Department of Biomedical and Diagnostic Sciences (CVM). She also is the Director of the UTIA Center for Wildlife Health, and currently serves as President of the Wildlife Disease Association. Dr. Miller received her DVM and PhD from Mississippi State University and completed a residency and postdoc in comparative pathology at the University of Miami School of Medicine.

Having grown up on a dairy farm in Wisconsin and in a family that hunted and fished, wildlife was a natural passion and the reason she pursued a career in wildlife, earning degrees in wildlife management, wildlife ecology and veterinary medicine. Combining her wildlife, veterinary medicine, and pathology training resulted in her focus on wildlife pathology. At UTIA, she collaborates with her husband, Dr. Matthew Gray, studying amphibian pathogens, particularly *Batrachochytrium salamandrivorans* (*Bsal*) and *Ranavirus*. Her specific interest is investigating the pathogenesis of the diseases caused by these pathogens and the environmental and host factors that contribute to disease progression. She also collaborates with Dr. Jeanette Wyneken from Florida Atlantic University on sea turtle health, investigating the impact of the environment (e.g., contaminants, rising temperatures) on hatchling success. Her students have studied a variety of wildlife health topics that impact Tennessee and the world as a whole.

Dr. Matt Gray is a Professor in the Department of Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries and an Associate Director of the UTIA Center for Wildlife Health. He received his PhD in Wildlife Science and Mathematics from Texas Tech University, and currently serves as the co-chair of the North American *Bsal* Task Force and the Disease Task Team of the Partners in Amphibian and Reptile Conservation.

Dr. Gray grew up in Michigan with a passion for waterfowl and wetlands, which led him to study waterbirds at Michigan State University (BS) and Mississippi State University (MS). He expanded his wetland research interest to amphibians during his PhD, and discovered an emerging virus in Tennessee amphibians shortly after he arrived to UTIA. His UTIA research has covered various topics in natural resources, including hardwood bottomland restoration, shorebird conservation, and developing rapid assessment techniques for estimating foraging carrying capacity for migratory waterfowl. Most recently, Dr. Gray’s research has focused on the epidemiology of amphibian pathogens, and evaluating disease intervention strategies to thwart outbreaks.

Drs. Miller and Gray met each other while graduate students at Mississippi State and married in 2010. The couple’s unique background of ecology and pathology allow them to lead wildlife disease research that transcends cellular, organismal and population levels. The couple recently secured a $2.5M grant from the National Science Foundation to study the emerging fungal pathogen, *Bsal*. Deb and Matt have a six-year-old son (Ethan) who joins them frequently in the field to do amphibian health assessments. The photos included herein are during the couple’s 6-month sabbatical in Spain in 2016.
The University is obligated to comply with federal research requirements, including the Bayh-Dole Act, which governs rights in inventions made with federal assistance. This Act applies to all federal agencies and governs all subject inventions, even if the federal government is not the sole source of funding. In May this year, the federal regulations that implement the Bayh-Dole Act were amended. According to the amended regulations, contractors such as the University are obligated to take certain actions to properly manage subject inventions. Perhaps the most important action is a new requirement for the University to have written agreements with all employees who work on federally funded projects.

UTRF and UT General Counsel drafted an Intellectual Property (IP) Agreement, and in August this year, the University sent the IP Agreements to all UT employees via email. UT employees should have a signed IP Agreement on file with the University. We understand new employees will be required to sign the agreement at their UT orientation.

Some employees have been concerned that UT Research Foundation’s royalty sharing policy has changed, but that is not the case. The University’s Statement of Policy on Patents, Copyrights, and Other Intellectual Property (Board Policy BT0024) has not changed, and the employees’ rights to Intellectual Property under the Policy have not changed, either.

To review and sign the Intellectual Property Assignment Agreement click this link: https://ipa.tennessee.edu/

References: Bayh-Dole Act 35 U.S.C. §§ 200-212; Amended regulation 37 CFR 401.14(a)

Grants.gov has a great resource for grantseekers
The Grant Writing Basics blog series provides a practical introduction to all that is involved with developing content for a federal grant application.

LINK: https://blog.grants.gov/

Pivot & Funding Opportunities

Pivot is a comprehensive database of funding opportunities and researcher profiles that is searchable by all researchers, staff, and students with a UT NetID. The funding opportunities database includes federal, non-federal, foundation, and private opportunities, both domestic and international, and represents the full range of academic disciplines and funding types.

You can access Pivot from anywhere after creating a Pivot account. You will need an account to save your funding searches, receive funding alerts, and claim your researcher profile. Additionally, Pivot allows for you to:

- Sign up to receive customized funding alerts
- Save and return to previous funding searches
- Share funding opportunities directly from Pivot
- Track individual funding opportunities
- Explore the profiles of millions of potential collaborators worldwide for potential collaborators
- Match funding opportunities with potential collaborators
- Receive email updates about opportunities based on your saved search queries
- Search for and receive notifications about calls for papers from upcoming conferences and scholarly journals
OSP is active in two professional associations for research administrators – the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) and the Society of Research Administrators International (SRA). Both organizations hold annual, regional, and specialized meetings offering educational programs for all levels of experience. Continuing education is important for OSP, and attendees return and share what they learned. In addition to attending, many of us have also presented.


Jane Burns, Will Helmrath, and Liz Hebert attended SRA’s Midwest/Southern Section meeting in April held in St. Louis, MO. Jane and Will co-presented a session titled United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) from the University Research Administrator Perspective.

Deedee Wilder and Everly Manes attended NCURA’s annual meeting in Washington, DC in August. Everly also participated by co-hosting a discussion group Contracting with Industry: Best Practices.

Later this month, Jane Burns, Will Helmrath, Debbie Hampstead, and Kathy Dalton will attend SRA’s annual conference in Orlando, Florida (originally to be held in Puerto Rico). Debbie and two colleagues will be presenting Building Mentor/Mentee Relationships for Professional and Institutional Growth, and Developing Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) Proposals will be presented by Will.

In addition to NCURA and SRA meetings, OSP staff members also regularly attend local training to help us serve you better. This includes IRIS, Excel, and other training provided by the university, webinars provided by federal sponsors, and compliance lunches and workshops.

As most of you know, UT has a new online format for Outside Interests Disclosure forms. If you haven’t completed your form, do so today at Outside Interests Disclosure 2018. The deadline to complete the form has been extended to November 1.

If you might be on a team submitting a proposal to NIH or another Public Health Service (PHS), answer Yes to the question “Are you participating in any PHS-funded research?” and complete the questions it prompts. NIH/PHS requires the questions be answered before a proposal is submitted. (This was previously a separate “Part II” form.)

While these forms are commonly known as Conflict of Interest forms, a disclosure on the form does not usually indicate a problem. When completing your form, if you are in doubt about whether an outside interest needs to be disclosed, it’s better to disclose it.

IRIS reports are available to help monitor reports, including ZQR_OUTINTDSC (which shows forms that have been fully routed) and ZWF_HISTORY (to check status of forms in process). See IRIS Administrative Support - Outside Interest Disclosure for more information.

If you have questions, feel free to contact Jane Burns at janeburns@utk.edu or 865-974-7375. Also, you can contact the IRIS helpdesk at irishelpdesk@tennessee.edu.

*Reference: University Fiscal Policy FI0125 Conflict of Interests

Check out this compliance news for UTIA:
- FY2018 IBC – Biosafety Report
- Human Research Protection Program October 2018 Newsletter
- Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee-OLAC October 2018 Newsletter

If you work in a facility inspected by IACUC, check out this preparation checklist: Are You Inspection Ready?
Serving as a Volunteer Peer-Reviewer for Grant Applications

Serving as proposal reviewer can be an eye-opening and informative experience. It helps investigators in their own grant preparations, as the review process from application review and reviewer discussions can prompt ideas about how to write and structure successful proposals.

While each agency has its own unique review process itself, program leaders seek to bring together reviewers from different backgrounds (geographic location, institution size and type, professional rank, gender, and ethnicity) with expertise to cover the range of proposals. Several investigators at UTIA have served and continue to serve as peer reviewers. This quarter, we are sharing insights from Dr. Tim Rials, who served most recently on a DOE review panel, and from Dr. Maria Cekanova on her ongoing experience as an NIH reviewer. Next quarter, we will share Dr. Meg Staton’s USDA experience.

Are you interested in becoming a reviewer for USDA or NIH? USDA encourages you to contact the National Program Leader in the Request for Application (https://nifa.usda.gov/panelist-information), while NIH asks you to contact them via their Enhancing Peer Review mailbox. (https://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/becoming_peer_reviewer.htm)

Dr. Tim Rials, PhD, Associate Research Dean for AgResearch and Director of the Center for Renewable Carbon

• How did you become a reviewer?
  The DOE BioEnergy Technologies Office solicitation on “BioEnergy Engineering for Products Synthesis” was released in late summer 2018. The program included six technical areas of interest, including one closely aligned with my research experience – Lignin Valorization. I was invited to serve as a reviewer of proposals in that topic area. This invitation, along with the many years of collaboration with BETO, has led to an extensive familiarity with the program and its goals, making it possible to better evaluate applications in those terms.

• What are your thoughts and takeaways from the experience?
  Because of the late release of the FOA, the review process was altered from their traditional approach. Reviewers were assigned up to 10 applications to assess and provide comments and ranking through their web portal. Responses to reviewer comments were provided by the PI’s and the opportunity to adjust scoring for the proposal was provided. While the prospect existed for follow up discussions, it was determined that was not necessary (presumably there was good agreement between rankings). It is unfortunate that there was no discussion among reviewers since that can often influence decisions, but apparently time constraints prevented that step this year. Even so, considerable benefit was gained from the process in that awareness of research activities around the nation was improved. This makes it possible to more accurately identify research gaps and opportunities for targeted development in our own programs.

Dr. Maria Cekanova, RNDr, PhD, Research Associate Professor in the Department of Small Animal Clinical Sciences at the UT College of Veterinary Medicine

• How did you become a reviewer?
  In 2014, when I received my first NIH R15 grant, I was invited by a scientific review officer (SRO) from the NIH Center for Scientific Review to serve as a reviewer on the BMIT-B study section. In 2018, I was invited to serve as a reviewer on the NIH Director’s Pioneer Award Program. This is a high profile, highly competitive granting mechanism intended to support individual scientists who propose pioneering approaches to produce a major impact on broad problems in biomedical and behavioral research. In addition, I was invited to serve as a reviewer for the R01 grant applications for NIH 2018/10 ZRG1 SBIB-HI(56)R and 2018/08 ZRG1 SBIB-S(59)R Special Emphasis Panel/Scientific Review Group for the Early Phase Clinical Trials in Imaging and Image-Guided Interventions and the Imaging and Biomarkers for Early Detection of Aggressive Cancer review within the Surgical Sciences, Biomedical Imaging & Bioengineering IRG. And most recently, I was invited to serve as a reviewer for R01 grant applications for the Early Phase Clinical Trials in Imaging and Image-Guided Interventions ZRG1 SBIB-C (56) Special Emphasis Panel.
Dr. Maria Cekanova (continued)

- What are your thoughts and takeaways from the experience?

Regardless of the programs, all scientific reviews have a common idea - to help the agency to identify the best proposals for funding consideration. The reviewers are asked to provide a priority score that reflects the scientific and technical merits of each application and provide a constructive feedback to PIs.

I appreciate even more the constructive critiques I receive on my own applications now after having become a reviewer. Most of the time I read proposals and write reviews in the evenings or over weekends. So it is important to make sure that proposals are easy to read for a tired reviewer, who add this commitment on top of their daily duties. I would also recommend that your figures and figure legends use large enough font sizes so that they are easily readable.

Additionally, it is most important to:

- talk to program officers to make sure your proposal is good fit for the specific call and identify the most appropriate study section (for NIH reviews) for your proposed work;
- read the instructions, follow the formatting requirements, and find enough time to prepare the proposal;
- submit your best possible applications - don’t submit unfinished proposals, it is a waste of your and the reviewers’ time;
- identify the problem in your research field and clearly address how your proposed work will contribute in solving this problem;
- catch your reviewers attention through well-written Specific Aims (NIH specific) documents and use the “Introduction to Application” document (known as “Response to previous review” in USDA applications) to address reviewer comments and highlight the key changes you’ve made to strengthen your resubmitted proposal;
- make all application documents consistent in formatting and easy to follow as each application packet is very long (sometimes over 100 pages);
- describe the previous experience of the PI and collaborators working as a team to show that the collaboration realistic and fruitful;
- showcase the scientific environment and equipment needed for research team to conduct the proposed research;
- indicate if you are an early stage independent investigator. NIH proposals submitted from the Early Stage and Early Established Investigators are usually discussed during the first session of the review meeting and ranked separately from Established Investigators.

OSP Celebrates Research Administrator’s Day >>>

by Debbie Hampstead

In August of 2015, the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) submitted National Research Administrator Day to be considered as a national day. The registrar at National Day Calendar then proclaimed National Research Administrator Day to be observed annually on September 25. This is a day to recognize the contributions made by administrators every day. Research administrators and managers serve an important role in supporting research. They assist the faculty and researchers, protect the organization, and assure sound stewardship of sponsored research dollars.

OSP celebrated Research Administrator’s Day this year by having pizza and cake for lunch and playing Research Administrator’s Bingo.
UTIA Office of Sponsored Programs Facebook & Twitter pages are avenues we use to keep you up to date with the ever changing events in Research Administration.

An additional source of information is our web page. (link)

You may submit questions, ideas or suggestions for improvements of our newsletter to aggrant@utk.edu.