

Research News

Please circulate to:

OFFICE of RESEARCH and SPONSORED PROGRAMS

December 2006

ROUTE ON TIME

Applications for funds that will be awarded to the university must be circulated for institutional review and approval before submission to the sponsor using a routing form (see www.wfu.edu/rsp/pdf/routing%20form.pdf). Due to the mandatory new federal electronic submission system, Grants.gov, which can be overloaded on certain dates, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) requests that those proposals be submitted at least a week prior to the deadline; therefore, the routing form is needed even earlier.

Routing forms are filled out by Principal Investigators and signed by their chairs before they come to ORSP, which then obtains the remaining approvals. If the project is part of a subcontract with the medical school or any other institution, the Reynolda campus investigator must still submit a routing form. A preproposal that requires an authorizing signature or institutional commitments must be routed. The only exceptions to this policy are applications for fellowships that are awarded to the individual, not the university. However, if applicants need financial or other support, their chair or dean must sign off in advance.

EFFORT REPORTS

ORSP has nearly finished certifying spring and summer effort using the new forms. We appreciate everyone's patient cooperation with this often confusing process. Here, we want to remind you of a few points that will prevent future problems.

Funds budgeted for summer salary must be paid in the summer for effort in the summer. You cannot receive additional compensation from sponsored projects during the academic year without prior written approval from the sponsor. Regardless of how much is budgeted for

summer salary, please only request payment equal to your effort.

Per university policy, outlined in chapter 5, section J, of the *Faculty Handbook*, you can only receive an amount equal to 3/9^{ths} of your annual salary for all summer activities. Those who teach during the summer must factor in teaching pay. Since raises are effective in July, you can base your July and August pay on your new salary. Unless you are on leave, you should not request more than 75% of your monthly pay for May or August, which are part of the academic year.

Most questions during the effort certification process concerned voluntary cost-share. Faculty may report cost-share for uncompensated academic year effort on their grants, but it is not required. The university already pays you to do research as a part of your academic-year appointment; voluntary cost-share should only be reported if documentation is sufficient to support the percent of voluntary cost-share proposed.

Finally, some good news! Beginning fall 2006, student timecards can be used in lieu of effort reports.

STATISTICS WEBSITE

from *Grantseeker Tips* 190 (1 August 2006)

A statistics website, <http://statpages.org>, features over 600 links, 380 calculating pages, and can help with nagging questions like:

- *Which statistical analysis should I use?
- *Where can I find free software packages?
- *How big a sample size do I need?
- *How do I calculate differences between groups?
- *How much confidence can I place in my results?

INSIDE

Outstanding Project Profile

3

IRB Notes

4

Humanities Journal Publishing

5

WAKE FOREST
UNIVERSITY

NIH GRANT RECEIPT DATES CHANGE IN JANUARY 2007

The standard receipt dates for both paper and electronic grant applications submitted to the National Institutes of Health change in January. The transition to electronic submission heightened awareness of the challenges posed by some 8,000 proposals arriving on any single day: bottlenecks at applicant research administration offices, which must now submit all applications; the Grants.gov and eRA submission systems; the Grants.gov and NIH help desks; and the Center for Scientific Review (CSR) Division of Receipt and Referral. Spreading receipt dates for a steady flow of applications rather than boom-and-bust cycles will maximize electronic system responsiveness.

The new dates are based on many factors, including:

- Most Grants.gov traffic is on the first, last, and 15th days of the month and the first Friday. NIH now offsets its deadlines to improve response times.
- Individual research project grants (R01s), NIH's most frequently used mechanism, are due on the 5th of the month to ensure they miss Grants.gov's heaviest days; for simplicity, R01 renewals are also due on the 5th.
- Added time is allowed for mechanisms often used by new investigators - R03 (small), R21 (exploratory/developmental), and K (research career development) awards.
- Academic Research Enhancement Award (AREA) dates, changed in fall 2005, remain 25 February; 25 June; and 25 October.
- New Investigator R01 dates were not changed to avoid affecting the pilot: 20 March; 20 July; 20 November (*see* <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-06-060.html>).

See <http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-07-001.html> for the specific changes.

NSF REVIEW STEPS

from Federal Grants and Contracts Weekly

1. The proposal arrives electronically and is routed to the appropriate program(s).
2. The program officer (PO) reviews it and, based on personal knowledge, references in the proposal, recent publications and presentations, citation databases, and the applicant's suggestions, assigns it to at least 3 outside experts.
3. Review may take place by mail, advisory panel, or a combination, using 2 overall criteria: intellectual merit and broader impacts. Divisional directors, deputy directors, and/or section heads oversee the process.
4. The PO receives the reviewer/panel recommendations, based on the merit criteria and risk, balance of priorities, and budget constraints.
5. The PO makes a recommendation to award or decline

the proposal, based on the external reviews, panel discussion, portfolio balance, and funds available.

6. Division leadership reviews PO recommendations.
7. The Office of Budget, Finance, and Award Management performs an administrative review.
8. Recommendations for large awards receive additional review by the director's review board and the National Science Board.

OVERALL NSF PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Divisional leadership assesses the program portfolio annually.
2. A visitor committee of scientists, engineers, and educators assesses each program every 3-5 years for the integrity and efficiency of its merit review and the quality of results.
3. Advisory committees of scientists, engineers, and educators review visitor committee reports and directorate responses and guide the directorates on future research and education activities.
4. The NSF's Advisory Committee for Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Performance Assessment, composed of external experts, evaluates directorate portfolios and their links to strategic goals, based on visitor committee reports, internal and external directorate assessments, investigator project reports, and directorate reports on awardees' outstanding accomplishments.
5. An external contractor independently verifies and validates NSF performance measurements.

COMPETITIVE EDGE

from Grantseeker Tips 195 (17 October 2006)

A former NSF program officer posed an interesting question: "Do you know the main reason NSF proposals get turned down? It's not because people fail to follow the guidelines, fall short on writing measurable objectives, omit scientific literature reviews, write fuzzy methodology sections, or anything similar."

He explained: "It's lack of money. In my experience, 20% of proposals are bad and rejected quickly. While 80% are good, we only have funds for 10%."

The conclusion is obvious: grantseeking is very competitive, and funding decisions are often based on secondary factors. Successful applicants may elevate their proposals by:

- presenting a strong argument for need, documenting the frequency and severity of the problem to be solved;
- before presenting the methodology, justifying why this particular approach was selected;
- including a strong dissemination section, indicating how the project outcomes will be communicated;
- realizing that readability—the proposal's appearance—

(Continued on page 3)

OUTSTANDING PROJECT PROFILE

BEN FRANKLIN TRANSATLANTIC FELLOWS SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR YOUTH

Associate Professor of Communication and Director of Debate Allan Loudon won \$203,250 from the US Department of State (DOS) to support a unique privilege: Wake Forest was chosen as the first host of a new national program to promote international understanding among youth. The award built on the success of Dr. Loudon's previous application to the DOS/Open Society Institute, which selected Wake Forest as one of two US universities to host the Southeastern Europe Youth Leadership Institute (SEELYI). Along with 13 community leaders and teachers, 60 high school students from Albania, Bulgaria, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, Romania, and Serbia spent July 2004 on campus and with volunteer families in the Winston-Salem area. Using debate as a vehicle, workshops explored US politics and culture.

In this year's Ben Franklin Transatlantic Fellows Summer Institute, 35 students between the ages of 16 and 19 from 32 European and Eurasian countries and 10 of their counterparts from across the US lived together in a residence hall, participated in workshops, completed community service projects, spent a weekend with local host families, and took field trips to the European Studies Center at UNC-Chapel Hill; Williamsburg; Washington, DC, where they received briefings from DOS experts on Iran and Iraq; and Philadelphia, where at breakfast, they discussed the Constitution with Ben Franklin.

John Dinan, Zachary T. Smith associate professor of Political Science, helped students to compare the US constitution-making process with those in European Union and post-Soviet countries. With Ross Smith, Wake Forest debate coach, they explored how the Internet and blogs influence the media, public opinion, and politics around the world. The program capitalized on the "most-wired" campus's resources to emphasize electronic connections—blogs to streaming video and podcasts to teleconferences to expert interactions via the web. Librarian Rosalind Tedford instructed them on Internet Resources; students were loaned laptops, and their own blogs and podcasts are available at www.bftf.org. Communication Professor Randy Rogan and Assistant Professor Don Helme taught a class on survey research.

Community service projects were conducted with the Brighton Gardens Retirement Community; Second Harvest Food Bank Warehouse; Food Bank Kids' Cafe Garden; Special Children's School for the Physically Disabled; and the Salvation Army Thrift Store and Boys and Girls Club.

A 16-year-old from Spain was pleasantly surprised by Wake Forest's campus: "[American universities] are huge, like another city, with hospitals, malls, and a field for every sport." A 17-year-old from Romania, who learned English from the Cartoon Network, was relieved to see "what America is really like" rather than the Hollywood version: "the streets aren't dirty, and everybody isn't carrying a gun." An 18 year-old from Belarus said, "People are friendly, and everyone smiles - American friendliness is very welcoming," and another, from Poland, described Americans as "open-minded and outgoing." However, a small group of the girls were very disappointed by our breakfasts; in the Krispy Kreme capital, they wanted "real food" rather than "donuts and cereal with colors in it."



The Ben Franklin Transatlantic Scholars on the National Mall in Washington, DC.

COMPETITIVE EDGE *(Continued from page 2)*

- may account for as much as 50% of a reviewer's funding recommendation; and
- incorporating a detailed budget narrative and timeline that match the specificity of the work plan.

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD NOTES

Alert! Secure IRB Approval for WFU-Sponsored Student Research

WFU-supported student projects that include human participants require Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval before funds will be released. Students planning cross-cultural projects and their faculty advisors must budget adequate time for review.

2006-2007 Deadlines:

Pro Humanitate Community-Based Research Grants (www.wfu.edu/phfund/research_grant.html): 29 January 2007. Scholars Program (www.wfu.edu/phfund/pro_humanitate_scholars.html): 12 February 2007. Contact: Dr. Betsy Taylor, taylorb@wfu.edu.

Richter Scholarships (www.wfu.edu/college/richter.html): 20 March 2007. Contact: Dr. Robert Browne, brownera@wfu.edu.

Summer Research Fellowships (www.wfu.edu/undergraduate_college/research-fellowship/about-the-program.htm): 17 March 2007. Contact: Dean Toby Hale, haleta@wfu.edu.

The IRB meets monthly *between September and April only*. International research proposals must be reviewed by the full board and can take 4-6 weeks, since they often involve knowledge of cultural and research parameters, foreign languages, interpreters/translators, and in-country contacts.

The PI and other key personnel, including faculty advisors, must complete CITI training in human participants' protection, which can take 6 hours, and the WFU-required international research-SBR module before research can begin. Access www.citiprogram.org and register as Wake Forest University.

For IRB deadlines, procedures, and forms, see www.wfu.edu/rsp/irb.html. For information on cross-cultural research and informed consent/assent for non-English speaking participants, see *Investigator's Guide*, www.wfu.edu/rsp/irb/guide.html.

Faculty advisors for student cross-cultural research, both domestic and foreign, must:

- complete basic CITI training and the WFU-required international research-SBR module;
- know IRB deadlines and procedures;
- understand cross-cultural study requirements;
- appreciate relevant cultural and research practices or ensure such expertise is available to the researcher;
- monitor the student's research at each stage; and
- contact the IRB for questions on research involving human participants.

Building Better Consent

Ethicist Steven Joffee, assistant professor of pediatrics at Children's Hospital, Boston, offers suggestions to assure that re-

searchers obtaining informed consent have the same understanding as participants of what the project entails:

1. Use a one-on-one, teach-back process.
 - A. "It's my job to explain things clearly. To make sure I did, can you tell me in your own words what I've said?"
 - B. Emphasize the important elements: "Tell me what you think will happen to you in this study"; or "What will you tell ___ when you get home? I want to make sure you can explain it to someone else because that's how I'll know you understand."
 - C. To clarify risks: "What do you think you'll gain if you participate?" "What bad things or good things could happen if you participate?"
 - D. Overall: "Who can you call if you have questions?"
2. In the informed consent document, raise a question the participant should be asking and answer it.
3. To offset literacy problems: "Would you rather I read the form to you, or do you want to go through it by yourself
4. Be aware that culture, gender, and status may affect comprehension and consent.
5. Actively eliciting expectations and emotions maximizes comprehension and minimizes anxiety. "I'd like to talk about ____, so you can decide about that option. What do you think about ____?" Identify fears: "I think I understand your concern. I want you to make the best decision for you."
6. Give participants time to digest the information, especially if risk is more than minimal. Let them leave and return to discuss and give you their answer.
7. Improve the consent document by making one point per paragraph; using common words, shorter sentences, a lot of white space; and large fonts, bold headings, and bullets rather than underlining or capitalizing.

Researchers Rate IRB

A summer survey asked faculty and staff to assess the effectiveness of IRB resources and the importance of IRB functions.

Replying to questions about resources:

- 50% use the IRB website to learn about changes in policy or procedures, followed closely by updates from colleagues;
- most check the website when they're ready to start a new application or need forms or instructions;
- very few know their department has an IRB reference binder that includes policies, procedures, forms, and OHRP guidance;
- 75% rate the IRB website as user-friendly ("good as is"); and
- most have no concerns about the move to eIRB, the online application and review system in development.

Functions most important to researchers include:

- timeliness; including timely response to PI inquiries;
- conscientious, informed analysis, weighing risks and benefits;
- upholding participants' rights while facilitating research;
- respectful, open, and pleasant interactions; and
- members understanding and acting within their mission.

HUMANITIES JOURNAL PUBLISHING: SCOPING, LURKING, COURTING

College of William and Mary Professor George Greenia, editor of *La Corónica: A Journal of Medieval Spanish Language, Literature, and Cultural Studies*, and *American Pilgrim*, a magazine on pilgrimage studies, treated faculty and graduate students to a practical and inspiring talk, hosted by the Romance Languages department, the Associate Provost for Research, and ORSP.

Scoping. Hopeful authors should know the economic realities of the journals to which they submit. While a few that cover a wide range of disciplines, like *PMLA*, have fairly large circulations, and some, generally glossier and more popular in appeal, like *Smithsonian*, may raise money for their parent institutions, 90% of humanities publications break even at circulations of about 400. Their survival becomes ever-more tenuous as readers expect information instantly and for free, albeit without critical oversight. Editors and reviewers are remunerated exclusively in professional and personal satisfaction.

So don't waste everyone's time by sending your article to a journal you've never touched. On leaving graduate school, you should be subscribing to at least 5 in your field, to support the community and to learn its style and substance.

Editors are committed to truth from two points of view: the articles they publish and the authors they mentor. First, they evaluate the truth of your article's claims and its shelf life – will it have currency 40 years from now? A trendy topic is not a liability, as the approach scholarship took in 2006 as compared to 2046 can remain interesting. Editors may encourage controversy to spark reader discussion and new directions.

Second, editors strive to maintain a truthful relationship with their writers, especially the up-and-coming. They may spend extra effort in rejecting an article to promote a better one next time. The copyediting is engaged, with a commitment to professionalism that includes anonymity. Blind submissions ensure junior *and* senior scholars serious review, so in the initial submission, don't cite yourself; don't thank your mentors; don't use your name in a running head or indicate your academic status, gender, age, ethnicity, or tenure status. The process should be quick: receipt acknowledged within 10 days, sent for review in 10 days, and to reviewers for 6 weeks. Inquire if you don't hear back in 3 months, and if the response is unsatisfactory, pull the article. Authors are due a transparent process.

Lurking. Professor Greenia proposed a writing protocol that sounded suspiciously like fun. First, lurk about a journal editor, *any* editor, to learn how everything works. Approach senior faculty to ask, "What are the top 10 journals I should

read? The 10 journals I should publish in?" Ask, "What are 5 publications you like to read?" to get a sense of the style intelligent people find engaging. Then identify 3 buddies, 2 in your discipline, and one valuable outsider who says "huh?" about your rarefied pronouncements. Try the following exercises:

- Explain in 60 seconds what you want to write.
- Ask your buddies to rephrase in "bold echo" what will excite readers about the ideas.
- Note their expectations about audience, methods, and content.
- Ask each for 5 questions: How expensive would it be to produce? Can you clarify . . . ?
- Ask each for 5 cranky questions – So what? What's new?
- Ask for a rousing conclusion. Later, move it to the opening.
- Print these ideas, one paragraph per page, and shuffle them.
- Ask the buddies to order them and to observe where something is missing.
- Use subheads to sequence; then see if you can remove them without losing coherence. The final product should have at most 5, and no Introduction or Conclusion, as placement makes both obvious.
- Check your vocabulary for repetition, jargon, dullness by replacing the spaces after words with a hard return and alphabetizing.
- Read the last sentence in each paragraph to see if you get a good sense of the text. When pressed for time, Professor Greenia assesses his interest in a piece this way.
- Make sure the first paragraph is powerful, not self-evident, apologetic, or appealing to authority – vestiges of the dissertation.
- Finally, ask for 5 titles. Compose the shortest from the best of each. Think indexibility, freshness, and fascination, but be sure it describes the content. Reviewers hate articles that don't deliver on the title.

Courting. In attracting an editor, play by the rules. Don't submit the same article to 2 journals simultaneously. If editors and reviewers have lavished attention on a piece that's issued elsewhere, you'll never publish in that journal again; you could bar yourself entirely from this small world.

Your short cover letter should contain contact information, the paper's title, and a ~100-word précis that includes significance. Affirm that it's not under consideration elsewhere and your willingness to revise; note that it stems from articles you've read in the journal by [drop names]. Ask when you may expect to hear back. Follow the submission guidelines. You might also send 2-3 illustrations, permissions secured, with captions, saving the editor the trouble. Copyediting may begin, "Cut by 20%." Understand that if you go long, another author is excluded.

Professor Greenia cultivates reviewers who will mentor. For your work, he will look at who you cite. How to become a reviewer? Submit manuscripts to the journal.

COMPUTER SCIENCE TO CO-HOST PRESTIGIOUS CONFERENCE

The Computer Science departments of Wake Forest University and Winston-Salem State University have been selected to co-host the 45th Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) Southeast Conference at the Benton Convention Center in downtown Winston-Salem, 23-24 March 2007. The longest running annual conference in the field invites computer science researchers, including students, to present papers, posters, and animations. Three keynote speakers will address plenary sessions. Friday evening, the third Southeastern Digital Animation Festival, organized by Yue-Ling Wong, will be held as part of the conference. Conference General Chairs David John, WFU, and Sandria Kerr, WSSU, and Program Chairs Paul Pauca, WFU, and Darina Dicheva, WSSU, expect about 200 participants.

The Special Sessions will be led by WFU faculty with substantial funding from the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and the Department of Energy, among other sources. Jacque Fetrow and Ed Allen chair Bioinformatics and Computational Biology; Errin Fulp joins colleagues from South Carolina and UNC-Greensboro to chair Computer and Network Security; and Yue-Ling Wong presides over presentations related to Entertainment Computing. See <http://acmse2007.wfu.edu/index.html> for details.

FULBRIGHT ACADEMY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Fulbright Academy of Science and Technology (FAST) seeks to advance education, research, policy, and commerce by making better use of a largely untapped resource—the quarter-million Fulbright scholars around the world. FAST was established in 2003 by alumni of the 60-year-old exchange program, focusing on those working in science and technology-oriented disciplines. Executive Director Eric Howard recently presented an informative talk on the organization, sponsored by the Wake Forest Scholars Program and Campus Fulbright Committee.

FAST is currently working on projects related to science literacy, clinical research ethics, digital libraries, and science history. Its March 2007 conference in Panama will examine how the Fulbright community is addressing the UN Millennium Development Goals: health, economic development, and environmental sustainability.

Funded by individual and institutional members and supporters, FAST does not award grants for research or travel. It supports research through study committees and projects that allow Fulbright grantees, alumni, and other experts to collaborate on research, policy development, and public education. Mr. Howard noted that foreign Fulbright fellows often rise to the top of their country's governments, so working with them

has tremendous potential to reach policymakers and to achieve fulfillment.

FAST also partners with researchers and institutions seeking funds from other sources. A collaboration with FAST might make a proposal more attractive to the sponsor.

As an alumnus, Mr. Howard also spoke about the Fulbright program. He noted one venue with which faculty may not be familiar—Senior Specialists (www.cies.org/specialists). Register as a consultant, and foreign institutions can invite you to collaborate during a 2-4-week visit. Not for personal research, these opportunities were developed to provide international networking experience in a more realistic timeframe than the semester or full year required for a traditional award. Students should be apprised that a Fulbright fellowship emphasizes intercultural relations more than research or professional development. Service and personal qualities will be valued as much or more than proposed projects. Students should start thinking about applying in their junior year.

See www.fulbrightacademy.org for details.

NSF URGED TO LEAD SCIENCE EDUCATION

From Federal Grants and Contracts Weekly 30, 22 (25 May 2006)

In the debate over how to improve science and math education, experts at a House Science Committee hearing urged that the National Science Foundation, rather than the Education Department, lead reforms and prioritize teacher training over curricula.

The Bush administration has repeatedly proposed putting STEM programs solely under the ED. Its 2007 American Competitiveness Initiative would provide \$380 million for new ED programs but cut NSF's K-16 programs by 7% after more than halving 2006 funding for them.

Education experts criticized the competitiveness initiative for focusing on curricula and praised NSF programs that pair teachers with scientists. A National Academy of Sciences report found nearly 70% of 6th-graders learn science from a teacher without a science degree or certificate and recommended focusing on professional development. After discussing whether math and science teachers should be paid more than other teachers, experts agreed that the question of fundamentals remains: "We can't teach math and science if the kids can't read."

COMPLIANCE HOT-LINE – 1-877-888-7888,

to anonymously report suspected violations of laws, regulations, rules, policies, procedures, ethics, or other information you feel uncomfortable reporting to a supervisor or faculty administrator. The operator, who is not a university employee, will discuss your concerns with you and report them to the University Compliance Office.

WFU Funded Research, 1 August - 31 October 2006

ANTHROPOLOGY

Kenneth Robinson

- *Challenge Cost-Share Agreement*, US Department of Agriculture (USDA), \$11,875
- *Survey, Handy District, Davidson and Montgomery Counties, NC*, Hobbs, Upchurch, & Associates, \$9,096.39
- *Phase I Survey, German Hill Tract, Caldwell Co., NC*, HDR Engineering, \$18,868.96
- *Cemetery Documentation, German Hill Tract, Caldwell Co., NC*, HDR Engineering, \$49,861.74
- *Excavation and Survey, William Smith House, Cumberland Co., NC*, Averasboro Battlefield Commission, \$15,711.23
- *Ground-Penetrating Radar of Possible Graves, Bentonville Battlefield, Bentonville Battlefield State Historic Site*, \$5,000

BABCOCK GRADUATE SCHOOL

Stanley Mandel, *Biotechnology Research: Innovation, Funding, and Ethics Symposium*, North Carolina Biotechnology Center, \$3,000

BIOLOGY

Susan Fahrback

- *Functional Genomics of Chronobiological Plasticity in the Honey Bee*, Bi-National Science Foundation, \$11,900
- *FIBR: BeeSpace – An Interactive Environment for Analyzing Nature and Nurture in Societal Roles*, National Science Foundation (NSF) \$111,678

Gloria Muday, *Ethylene and Auxin Crosstalk in Control of Root Architecture*, USDA, \$340,000

CHEMISTRY

Rebecca Alexander, *Dissection Protein and Nucleic Acid Contributions to Efficient tRNA Aminoacylation*, National Foundation for Cancer Research, \$50,000

COMPUTER SCIENCE

Errin Fulp, *Integrated Scalable Parallel Firewall and Intrusion Detection System for High-Speed Networks*, Greatwall Systems, Inc./ Department of Energy, \$22,260

V. Pau'l Pauca, *Computational Methods for Quantum Molecular Dynamics*, Targacept, Inc., \$16,000

Robert Plemmons, *DTO Advanced Imaging Seedling Project, Supplementary Funds*, Army Research Office (ARO), \$62,026

ENGLISH

Connor O'Callaghan, *Poetry Reading by Devin Johnston at Wake Forest University*, North Carolina Humanities Council, \$960

HEALTH & EXERCISE SCIENCE

Michael Berry, *Claude D. Pepper Older Americans Independence Centers*, National Institutes of Health (NIH), \$10,739

Peter Brubaker, with Anthony P. Marsh, *Physical Exercise to Prevent Disability, Pilot Study (LIFE)*, NIH, \$55,393

Steve Messier, *Intensive Dietary Restriction with Exercise in Arthritis*, NIH, \$593,196

Patricia Nixon, *Antenatal Steroids and Blood Pressure in Children: Prenatal Events - Postnatal Consequences*, NIH, \$56,732

Walter J. Rejeski, *Translating Research into Practice (TRIP)*, NIH, \$59,700

Walter J. Rejeski, and Anthony P. Marsh, *Co-Core Leaders for Clinical Research in Claude D. Pepper Older Americans Independence Center*, NIH, \$15,149

Walter J. Rejeski, with Paul Ribisl and Gary Miller, *Look AHEAD*, NIH, \$104,010

LAW SCHOOL

Kate Mewhinney, *Client Needs Fund*, North Carolina Bar Association, \$2,000

MATHEMATICS

Robert Plemmons, *DTO Advanced Imaging Seedling Project, Supplementary Funds*, ARO, \$62,026

PHYSICS

David Carroll, *Novel Carbon Nitride (CNW) Conjugates for Breast Cancer*, Department of Defense, Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs, \$91,055

Gregory Cook, *Quasiequilibrium BH-BH and NS-BH Binary Initial Data*, NSF, \$35,000

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Katy Harriger, *CIRCLE Study on College Students and Civic Engagement*, CIRCLE, \$1,200

STUDENT LIFE

Andrea Ellis, *Campus Kitchen at Wake Forest University*, The Campus Kitchens Project, Inc., \$39,042

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
Wake Forest University
117E Reynolda Hall, PO Box 7528
Winston-Salem, NC 27109
336-758-5888; fax 336-758-1959; <http://www.wfu.edu/rsp>

LORI MESSER
Director
336/758-4910
messerlj@wfu.edu

STEPHEN WILLIAMS
Assistant Director
336/758-4909
williasl@wfu.edu

JULIE EDELSON
Researcher, Editor
336/727-0464
edelsojb@wfu.edu

GLORIA STICKNEY
Coordinator, Research Services
336/758-4189
stickngd@wfu.edu

HENNY WAKEFIELD
Coordinator, IRB Administration
336/758-5195
wakefihk@wfu.edu

ASHLEY KESTER
Student Assistant

PAUL SUWAY
Student Assistant,
Graphic Layout/Design

MEAGAN MILLER
Student Assistant

CHRIS LANGLEY
Student Assistant

Research
News