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Announcements:
Internal CDA Opportunities

• BIRCWH – Building Interdisciplinary Research Careers in Women’s Health
  – 75% protected research effort (verified through chair nomination letter)
  – Strong interest in pursuing an academic research career in women’s health and/or sex/gender life science
  – Application deadline: March 1, 2018

• Georgia CTSA KL2 Program
  – 75% protected research effort (verified through chair nomination letter)
  – Research proposal must have a “human component,” i.e. interaction with human subjects or specimens obtained from identifiable humans.
  – Application deadline: March 1, 2018
Today’s Learning Objectives

1. Appreciate different pathways that can lead to an independent research career.
2. Learn practical steps and best practices that will help you achieve research independence.
3. Seek answers from researchers who have successfully navigated the research funding path to independence.
Seed, Foundation, Government Funding

What types of funding exist?
Seed/Pilot Funding Opportunities

✓ Smaller awards towards collecting preliminary data
✓ Many are offered locally (institutional, internal)
✓ List of opportunities listed at these links:
  • http://www.pedsresearch.org/research/resources/funding/pilot-grant-programs
  • http://www.medicine.emory.edu/research/internal-research-resources/funding-opportunities/index.html#Funding Opportunities
  • http://www.osp.emory.edu/funding/Internal.html
✓ Can also join relevant listserv’s to learn about internal seed funding opportunities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Award more grants with larger budgets</td>
<td>• Usually more competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More likely to pay indirect costs</td>
<td>• Bureaucratic/red tape/hoops/lengthy RFA’s with lots of acronyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear guidelines &amp; common application instructions/formats</td>
<td>• Application requirements can be more complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stated priorities for funding &amp; available to wide array of organizations and areas of research</td>
<td>• Many postaward requirements/stipulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set and predictable deadlines (usually)</td>
<td>• Although set/recurring deadlines, they also release special funding announcements often with a short turnaround time (6 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More staff and resources for assistance and feedback during application phase</td>
<td>• Review process may favor established investigators (although NIH and NSF are trying to address this)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can find very specialized/focused opportunities presumably with more favorable funding odds (i.e. fewer applicants)</td>
<td>• Award dollars usually less and may be restricted (e.g. no PI salary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some make large grants</td>
<td>• Often do not allow indirect costs which can “cost” the awardee money – “Dean’s Tax”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good source for seed, high risk/high reward grants &amp; CDA’s</td>
<td>• LOI step can also present a disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many require relatively easy LOI &amp; then accept full applications by invitation only</td>
<td>• Program staff not always available to help you tailor your aims/application during application phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Application requirements can be less rigorous</td>
<td>• Oftentimes applicants get no reviews/feedback making resubmissions and continuous improvement difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Often more flexible in meeting unique needs, circumstances and time frames</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introducing Our Panelists

Through a high level snapshot of their own research funding path...

Disclaimer

• Accurate, but not necessarily complete
• This is the 20,000 foot view – all details not included
Kelly Bijanki, PhD

Assistant Professor, Neurosurgery, Dept. of Medicine, Emory University
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Red font = MPI grant
# Rebecca D. Levit, MD

Assistant Professor, Cardiology Dept. of Medicine, Emory University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior T32/35 funding</th>
<th>Rebecca Levit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Seed</td>
<td>2015 LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Seed</td>
<td>2015 Seed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Foundation</td>
<td>2015 Seed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Foundation ($$*)</strong></td>
<td>2017 Seed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Foundation</td>
<td>2018 NIH R01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty
Associate Professor, Hematology/Oncology, Dept. of Pediatrics, Emory University, Wallace H. Coulter Department of Biomedical Engineering Georgia Tech & Emory University

Prior F32 Funding

- 2009 K08
- 2011 Pilot
- 2012 U54 Project MPI

Wilbur Lam

- NSF Project PI
- U01 project PI
- 2013 NSF
- 2014 R01
- 2015 R21
- 2016 R01
- 2018 U54
- 2018 NSF
- 2018 R01
- 2018 R21
- 2018 R43

DoD Grant
- 2014 Pilot
- 2015 Pilot
- 2016 NSF
- 2018 U54

Faculty

Red font = MPI grant
Claudia R. Morris, MD

Associate Professor, Emergency Medicine, Dept. Pediatrics, Emory University
In business it is most often all about getting your foot in the door and once you do, everything opens up and things start to naturally progress into bigger and more opportunities.

(Lori Greiner)
Getting your foot in the grant funding door

• What do you consider the critical parts of your own funding path that led you to securing your own independent funding?
  – Pilot data
  – Foundation grants
  – Working with others on their funded grants
Role for Mentors

• In what meaningful ways did you engage your mentors/did they engage you while working towards independence?

• What people other than your mentor were instrumental in helping you move to independence? How did you go about building those relationships?
Selecting your research focus

• How did you differentiate your own research path from your mentor’s? Was it up front and deliberate, or did it organically develop along the way?

• How did you select the best ideas to pursue in your first independent research grant application?
Importance of Service

• How did you find opportunities to establish yourself professionally through scientific citizenship and leadership roles?
  – Reviewing grants and articles
  – Service on university committees
  – Service on scientific advisory boards
  – Mentoring

• When to say “yes” and how to say “no”
Institutional Resources

• What institutional programs and resources facilitated your transition to research independence?

* Courses *

* Cores *

* Programs *

[Logos of Emory University, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University School of Medicine, Department of Medicine, Georgia CTSA, and Emory Children's Research Alliance]
Key Non Scientific Education & Soft Skills

• What are the non scientific specific skills key to running a research lab/study team and how did you learn them?
  – Grants/financial management
  – Hiring and managing employees
  – Team building
  – Conflict resolution
  – Negotiation
Time Management

• What strategies do you use to balance competing priorities?
• What’s your best time management tip?
Customize your own roadmap to success!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sam Smith Research Roadmap</th>
<th>Created 2/1/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>August 2018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with mentors to review progress &amp; Specific Aims</td>
<td>Submit manuscript to Circulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submit by Aug 30</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
get cape.    wear cape.    fly.