Format for Application for Support by the School of Medicine (SOM) Academic Enrichment Fund (AEF) of Strategic Infrastructure for Research Initiatives

Application Process: The Strategic Infrastructure for Research Committee (SIRC) is composed of active research faculty who advise the Dean on AEF expenditures for broad multi-departmental facilities or programs that support infrastructures that are strategic to the SOM research mission. Such infrastructure includes unique shared equipment, development of novel Core Services or other Shared Resources that encompass multiple users from multiple departments across campus.

Eligibility. Specific research projects or investigators will not be funded. Applications that provide service or shared resources to a limited pool of investigators are not likely to be successful. Proposed Core Services should be novel and not duplicative of existing services elsewhere on campus unless additional need is well justified. Requests for equipment upgrades/replacement from existing Cores are discouraged unless all other potential sources of funding have been exhausted.

The application process should begin with a 1- to 2-page letter to the Dean describing the proposed infrastructure project and the expected cost to the AEF. (See details below.) The letter should reach the Dean as soon as possible to allow for a timely response. If the proposed infrastructure is judged potentially appropriate for AEF support, the investigator will be advised to submit a formal application. The SIRC’s review will then be used to advise the Dean’s decision.

General Principles of Review: The review process will consist of a constructive analysis of strengths, weaknesses, and potential importance to the SOM’s research endeavor, based on consideration of specific criteria (given below). Participation in/utilization of the proposed research support initiative/facility should be open to all qualified Medical School faculty, and a plan for education and active recruitment of members from multiple departments should be included. Participation by faculty members from other UCD schools is encouraged. Funding may be allocated for 1, 2, or 3 years.

Specific Review Criteria and Guidelines for Constructing the Application:
1. Cover Sheet: Title, PI(s), Amount requested each year and total, brief abstract

2. Proposed Infrastructure and Scientific Importance [2 pages suggested]:
   - What infrastructure is proposed?
   - What scientific questions will it help solve?
   - Why is it important?
   - Why is it timely?

Describe in detail the goals and activities of the proposed infrastructure and how the goals will be implemented.
3. **Predicted Impact of Research that Will be Supported by New Infrastructure** [2 pages suggested]:
   - What is the relevance of the infrastructure-supported research to science and how will this position SOM and UCD strategically with regard to research funding?
   - What is the predicted impact on research quality and productivity in the SOM? Will the infrastructure support a unique research area or expertise in the School?
   - Who are all the major users across campus (should be from multiple departments) of the new infrastructure? Major potential users should be documented by a letter of support that ideally includes monetary commitment (i.e., matching funds) to support the new infrastructure.
   - How will the program/facility foster new collaborations within the institution?

4. **Administration and Leadership** [1 page suggested]:
   - Who are the key personnel and key participants? [Attach NIH-formatted biosketches with grant support for key personnel as an appendix]
   - What is the administrative structure and major responsibilities of key personnel?
   - How will the SOM faculty be made aware of the equipment, core service or shared facility?
   - How will potential users be trained to use the facility, if necessary?
   - What space will be needed for the program/facility? Is that space available?
   - What are the specific, measurable criteria that will be used for assessing success of the program/facility?

5. **Business Plan** [1 page suggested]:
   - Clearly justify each item of the budget (include equipment quotes as an appendix). Describe in detail how the requested budget will be applied to achieving the program’s/facilities’ goals and relevance to the SOM research mission. Will the facility be used to study patients? If so, what impact will this have on the facility’s budget?
   - List all other sources of funding for the initiative (including those already secured and those that are pending). Are there other extramural or intramural funds pending that may offset AEF funds? Describe any overlap with other AEF funding.
   - How will continued operational costs be sustained beyond the initial AEF investment? If applicable, address the following:
     - What will be the fee structure for services?
     - How will equipment service contracts/maintenance fees be covered?
     - How will equipment be updated or replaced in the future?
     - How will salary for technicians be covered?
   - How will AEF dollars be leveraged to gain additional funding?
     - Will there be departmental matching funds?
     - What will happen to the initiative if outside funds are not obtained?

For equipment costing over $200K, the SIRC will consider AEF matching funds for an NIH or NSF application for a Shared Instrument Grant (SIG). Thus, potential applicants for support of new
or replacement core equipment must plan well ahead. Exceptions to this requirement may be considered if applications include a pledge of matching funds equivalent to one-third the cost of the equipment and description of a compelling reason for not applying for a SIG.

**Failure to address the following will result either in the application not being reviewed or rejected.**

1. Comprehensive documentation of a broad user group from multiple departments in the SOM to illustrate the benefit to the larger community
2. Documentation of efforts to leverage some financial support from key Departments/users
3. Comprehensive Business Plan that addresses all points above in #5.

[**ABSOLUTE** total page limit 6 plus single title page, 12-point font, 1.5-spaced, 1-inch margins throughout]

**SPRING QUARTER REVIEW, 2017**

**Electronic** letters of intent (LOI) should be sent to Brenda.Crawford@ucdenver.edu; Richard.Davis@ucdenver.edu and Peter.Buttrick@ucdenver.edu by **no later than Wednesday, February 5, 2017 at 5 pm**. **Note that the sooner the LOI is reviewed and accepted, the longer the time available to complete the full application.** If the initiative is approved for full review, applicants should e-mail their total application with appendices as ONE FILE to Brenda.Crawford@ucdenver.edu by **no later than Monday, March 1, 2017 at 5 pm**. Do not include the LOI with the application. Applications received after this deadline or that do not comply with the format described above will be returned for possible submission at the next scheduled review. Questions may be addressed to Peter.Buttrick@ucdenver.edu

**Note:** Applications must be accompanied by a signed statement of approval of the proposal by the department chair or division chief of each of the PIs/Co-PIs and by the chair of any department whose space or equipment would be used to carry out the proposed initiative. These statements may be accompanied by comments in support of the application, but this is not required.