NC SEED GRANT RECIPIENTS

Congratulations to the 2010 Nutrition Center Seed Grant recipients!
This year we have two recipients:

**Dr. Maryah Fram** for her proposal, "Experiences of hunger by children in Hispanic families in South Carolina" and

**Dr. Christine Blake** for her proposal, “Developing a model to assess label impact on parent demand for child beverages”

Congratulations to both!

New Affiliated Scholars

Please join us in welcoming our newest Nutrition Center Affiliated Scholars:

- Sarah Battersby
- Lyndie Forthofer
- Melayne McInnes
- Orgal Ozturk

Promotions!

Congratulations to

**Angela Liese** (NC Director),
**Jan Probst** (NC Steering Group member & AS), and
**Sara Wilcox** (NC AS)!!!

The President has recommended to the Board of Trustees that they all be promoted to Full Professor! Congratulations!

---

Nutrition Center Affiliated Scholars Recent Publications:


Huang SJ, Hung WC, Sharpe PA, Wai JP. Neighborhood environment and physical activity among urban and rural schoolchildren in Taiwan. Health Place. 2010 May;16(3):470-6. PMID: 20137996


**ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTAL BIOLOGY PRESENTATIONS:**


**UPCOMING EVENTS:**

**Healthy Carolina Farmers Market** The Healthy Carolina Farmers Market is a convenient way for USC students, faculty and staff to shop for fresh, healthy, locally grown products.

Market dates for the Summer are **every Tuesday from 10-2pm June 1st-August 3rd**. Location is next to the Russell House.

For more information, contact Sarah Epting at srgause@mailbox.sc.edu or 803-777-6363
Highlights from the Nutrition Center NIH Grantwriting Workshop: Responding to the new review criteria and Guidelines

Panel Dawn Wilson-King, Wilfred Karmaus, Suzi Baxter, Angela Liese

1. Prior to rant review it is important to remember how critical a cover letter is. YOU should choose the review group/study section to which your proposal should be sent. YOU should choose the institute (different paylines). YOU should choose the program officer (will be your cheerleader at council meeting). If you don’t get what you ask for, ask that it be changed. You’re SRO is important, too since they choose who reviews your proposal, too.

2. How do you get the project officer excited about your project? Ask hard questions, be efficient with their time, find someone with similar research interests.

3. About paylines: Different Institutes pay at different percentile rankings of proposals. NICHD pays at around 8th percentile while NIDDK pays at 12th. Over the course of the year, Institutes become less restrictive about payline so that proposals submitted in Feb and reviewed in spring will have better paylines.

4. New Criteria since June 09.
   a. Impact Score: 1-9. The range of discussion varies for the type of Investigator. New Investigators are typically discussed at the level slightly above the top 50%. Experienced Investigators are discussed at the level slightly less than 50%.
      i. Typically need a 1-2 to get funding. Impact score is about what’s the potential of this project to have long term significant impact on public health.” sustained powerful influence on the field”
   b. Significance: how will this science improve PH
   c. Investigators: remember this is team science; don’t be intimidated by this one; get good consultants.
   d. Innovation: what new is offered.
   e. Approach:
   f. Environment

5. Short form: R01 12 pages; R21 6 pages
   a. 1 PAGE Aims: write impact into aims page. Write one sentence on significance and innovation in aims, too. 1 aim/year MAX.
   b. Significance
   c. Innovation
   d. Approach
      i. Investigative team first part here; integrate preliminary studies here
      ii. Use a graphic to help reader find things in approach.
      iii. Cite limitations of approach throughout.
      iv. For each aim write a rationale, strategy, expected result, critique
      v. End with power calculation and timeline