

# Request for Proposal (RFP)/ Call for Grants

---

To: Educational Providers  
From: Linda Battiato, Medical Education Grant Officer, Alzheimer's Disease  
Date: 3/13/24

**Note:** This grant request was jointly developed through a collaboration between the Lilly Grant Office IME department ("Lilly") and the Fujirebio Diagnostics, Inc department of Scientific Affairs ("Fujirebio"). Should you decide to respond, you will be required to submit two separate applications: one to Lilly and one to Fujirebio. There may be some differences in information required by each company, as more specifically provided below.

Lilly and Fujirebio are committed to supporting high-quality education that can lead to improvements in healthcare professionals' knowledge, competence, and/or performance in order to ultimately have a positive impact on patient care and outcomes. Lilly and Fujirebio do not support Independent Medical Education, or any medical activities, for the purpose of encouraging off-label use of our products.

***Grant proposals that include collaboration and/or partnerships with relevant professional organizations and societies are encouraged. Multi-supported proposals are encouraged.***

**PLEASE READ THIS DOCUMENT IN ITS ENTIRETY AND  
ENSURE THAT YOUR PROPOSAL INCLUDES ALL OF THE REQUESTED INFORMATION.  
INCOMPLETE PROPOSALS MAY NOT BE FORWARDED  
TO THE GRANT COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION.**

**PLEASE DO NOT FORWARD RFP BEYOND INDIVIDUALS IN YOUR ORGANIZATION UNLESS YOU  
INTEND TO PARTNER WITH THEM FOR PROPOSAL SUBMISSION**

## **A. Purpose:**

Lilly and Fujirebio are currently seeking continuing education proposals to improve the care of patients with early symptomatic Alzheimer's disease mild cognitive impairment (MCI) due to Alzheimer's disease (AD) or mild dementia due to AD by improving the ability of health care providers (HCPs) to integrate fluid biomarkers into the AD diagnostic algorithm to provide a timely and accurate diagnosis. Evidence demonstrates the following healthcare gap:

Patients with early symptomatic Alzheimer's disease often experience delayed or inaccurate diagnosis, contributing to suboptimal management and poorer outcomes.<sup>1-6</sup> New and emerging treatments that slow the progression of disease in early symptomatic patients introduce new urgency into the need for timely and accurate diagnosis.<sup>7-12</sup>

**B. Budget and Due Date:** Lilly and Fujirebio will consider funding 1 proposal with a total available budget of \$250,000 split equally between Lilly and Fujirebio

**Proposal due by: 4/12/24**

Ideally programs will launch by early Q3 2024

**C. HCP Performance/Practice Gap(s):** Evidence suggests that the above Patient Healthcare Gap(s) is due to the fact(s) that some HCPs <sup>1-6,13-16</sup>

# Request for Proposal (RFP)/ Call for Grants

- ❑ Delay and/or make errors in clinical and neuropathological diagnosis of early symptomatic AD
- ❑ Fail to consistently adhere to recommendations for the use of fluid biomarkers for patients with early symptomatic AD
- ❑ Do not feel a sense of urgency to diagnose early symptomatic AD
- ❑ May not integrate knowledge about scientific and clinical advances in AD fluid biomarkers and AD treatment into practice

***The applicant must independently validate the healthcare practice gaps and provide references.***

**D. Root Causes:** The applicant must provide clear, well researched insights into the root cause(s) (i.e., reasons underlying each Performance/Practice Gaps) that are preventing some HCPs from performing optimally and that will be addressed in the educational initiative. Methods used to identify root causes must be described and references provided. Potential root causes may include 13-20:

- Lack of awareness regarding:
  - The emerging evidence highlighting the use of fluid biomarkers to detect AD pathology and facilitate diagnosis in patients presenting with cognitive impairment
  - The advantages and limitations linked to the use of AD biomarkers, as well as the sensitivity and accuracy of various methods and assays used for the assessment of patients with early symptomatic AD
- Lack of skills and confidence to appropriately integrate fluid biomarker assessments into the AD diagnostic pathway
- Challenges in keeping up with advances in AD treatment and limited awareness of the importance of timely and accurate diagnosis to appropriately identify patients for new and emerging disease modifying therapies (DMTs) for AD

***Preference will be given to proposals that:***

- 1) Provide a high level of evidence for the Root Cause(s)
- 2) Have used well respected Root Cause Analysis methods
- 3) Focus on Root Causes related to deficiencies in competence/skills, strategies, attitudes, beliefs, available point of care tools and resources, and/or other abilities that prevent HCPs from performing optimally in practice (i.e., as opposed to proposals that focus primarily on deficiencies in underlying declarative and/or procedural knowledge.)

**E. Target Audience:** The intended audience includes the following HCPs involved in the care of patients with AD including:

- ❑ Dementia specialists, Neurologists, Geriatricians, Geriatric Psychiatrists and neuropsychologists

**HCPs located in the United Kingdom may not be directly targeted (i.e., via email or a UK hosted website) in the targeted HCP reach.**

The applicant must provide an evidence-based rationale for the target audience(s) explaining:

- How the target audience(s) is important in closing the gap and addressing the Root Cause(s)
- How the education will be customized to any unique learning needs of different HCPs – if necessary
- How the HCPs/Teams with the greatest needs will be targeted, recruited, and engaged.

***Preference will be given to proposals that have a well-reasoned strategy for targeting and engaging those HCPs/Teams with the greatest need (i.e., versus proposals that seek to recruit less appropriate practitioners to maximize the number of participants).***

**F. Learning Objectives:** Provide Learning Objectives that are the intended outcomes of the activity (i.e., what learners should be able to do better or differently upon completion of the activity)

# Request for Proposal (RFP)/ Call for Grants

- Learning Objectives should be SMART (**S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**ealistic and **T**imebound) and/or conform to the ABCD rubric (**A**udience, **B**ehavior, **C**onditions, **D**egree (**See references on Learning Objectives below**))
- Indicate the proportion of the total activity/curriculum time that will be allocated to each Learning Objective

**Preference will be given to proposals that emphasize LOs that describe and are aligned with the intended skills, strategies, and behaviors that address the Root Cause(s) (i.e., the competencies that are needed to improve patient care)**

**G. Content Topics, Instructional Methods/Tactics/Resources:** Provide an outline of the content that you will include and describe and explain the activity type(s), format(s), learning experiences, instructional tactics, resources and/or materials that you are proposing for effective learner achievement of each Learning Objective.

**Preference will be given to approaches that:**

- Are based in the science of learning and research on physician learning (See examples of references below). Provide references to support that these types of interventions have been proven to enhance learning.
- Use evidence-based educational formats/modalities/techniques that have been demonstrated to lead to high completion rates, build skills that result in real-world practice improvements (e.g., high-levels of learner involvement, interactivity, demonstrations, practice & feedback, reflection, high relevance to practice, case-based, simulations, inclusion of practical resources/methods to help reinforce and apply learnings in practice, etc). *See references below*
- Include examples of outcomes achieved for activities with similar instructional approach and LOs.

**H. Outcomes Plan:** The proposal must use definitions outlined in the [Outcomes Standardization Project \(OSP\) Glossary](#). The Outcomes Plan for capturing metrics on the following items should be clearly stated in the proposal: At a minimum, **Expected # of Learners, and Expected # of Completers.**

Describe the specific outcomes design, methods and measures that will be used to determine the extent to which learners have achieved each of the Learning Objectives – i.e., the intended outcomes.

**A generic description of an outcomes model (e.g., Moore's Model, Kirkpatrick, etc.) is not sufficient.**

- Provide the number and types of measures/questions/survey items/chart reviews, etc. that will be used to assess achievement of each Learning Objective
- Estimate the number of completers who will provide data/participate in each component of the Outcomes Plan
- Estimate the degree of improvement you expect for each Learning Objective.
- Provide the qualifications of those involved in the design and analysis of the outcomes.

**Preference will be given to proposals that:**

- Incorporate objective measures of competence, performance, and/or patient outcomes
- Measure long-term retention and application of new skills, etc. in practice
- Use validated measures that have been demonstrated to be reliable
- Provide statistical analyses (p values, effect sizes, and item statistics (e.g., discrimination index, difficulty for any Multiple Choice Questions) – (MCQs are not required, but if used should be psychometrically sound)

**I. Content Accuracy:** Lilly and Fujirebio are committed to the highest standards for ensuring patient safety. Describe methods to ensure complete, accurate, evidence-based review of key safety data for

# Request for Proposal (RFP)/ Call for Grants

any therapeutic entities discussed in the activity. Explain how content will be updated, if necessary, throughout the program period to ensure accuracy will be ensured.
<b>J. Faculty Recruitment and Development:</b> Provide information on the expected qualifications of contributors and describe the methods used to ensure recruitment of course directors and faculty who meet the qualifications. Explain any methods that will be used to ensure that faculty are fully trained in the program expectations and any skills that may be needed to ensure effective delivery of intended education.
<b>K. Accreditation:</b> Grant applicants must be, or partner with, an accredited provider. It is preferred that activities be certified (e.g., CME/CE) by the appropriate accrediting bodies and fully compliant with all ACCME Criteria and Standards for Integrity and Independence in Accredited Continuing Education.
<b>L. Resolution of Conflict:</b> The proposal should briefly describe methods for ensuring fair and balanced content and identification and resolution of any conflict of interest.
<b>M. Communication and Publication Plan:</b> Include a description of how the results of this educational intervention will be presented, published, and/or disseminated.
<p><b>N. Mandatory Requirements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please limit the length of your grant proposal to <b>20 pages or less</b> (not including references and budget).</li> <li>• All responses to this RFP must be submitted no later than close of business (5:00 PM ET) on 4/12/24</li> </ul> <p>Please submit the same proposal to Lilly and Fujirebio</p> <p><b><u>Submission to Lilly</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All responses to this RFP are to be submitted online through the Lilly Grant Office grant application system at <a href="https://portal.lillygrantoffice.com">https://portal.lillygrantoffice.com</a></li> <li>• When submitting your proposal, you must include “RFP: [title of program]” in your grant submission.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Submission to Fujirebio</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All responses to this RFP are to be submitted via email to Dr. Francesca De Simone, PhD (<a href="mailto:DeSimoneF@fdi.com">DeSimoneF@fdi.com</a>) and to Diana Dickson (<a href="mailto:dicksond@fdi.com">dicksond@fdi.com</a>)</li> <li>• When submitting your proposal, you must include “RFP: [title of program]” in your grant submission.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Questions and Communication</u></b></p> <p>All questions and communication must be submitted to both the Lilly Grant Office at <a href="mailto:lillygrantoffice@lilly.com">lillygrantoffice@lilly.com</a> AND Fujirebio at <a href="mailto:DeSimoneF@fdi.com">DeSimoneF@fdi.com</a></p>

# Request for Proposal (RFP)/ Call for Grants

---

## References

1. Alzheimer's Association. 2023 Alzheimer's Disease Facts and Figures. *Alzheimers Dement* 2023;19(4). DOI 10.1002/alz.13016.
2. Gauthier S, et al. World Alzheimer Report 2022. Available at: <https://www.alzint.org/u/World-Alzheimer-Report-2022.pdf>
3. Bernstein Sideman A, Al-Rousan T, Tsoy E, et al. Facilitators and barriers to dementia assessment and diagnosis: perspectives from dementia experts within a global health context. *Front Neurol*. 2022;13
4. Dubois B, Padovani A, Scheltens P, et al. Timely diagnosis for Alzheimer's disease: a literature review on benefits and challenges. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2016;49:617-631
5. Judge D, Roberts J, Khandker R, et al. Physician perceptions about the barriers to prompt diagnosis of mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. *Int J Alzheimers Dis*. 2019;36:37954
6. Porsteinsson, A.P., Isaacson, R.S., Knox, S. *et al*. Diagnosis of Early Alzheimer's Disease: Clinical Practice in 2021. *J Prev Alzheimers Dis* 8, 371–386 (2021).
7. Ana R. Monteiro, Daniel J. Barbosa, Fernando Remião, Renata Silva, Alzheimer's disease: Insights and new prospects in disease pathophysiology, biomarkers and disease-modifying drugs, *Biochemical Pharmacology*, Volume 211, 2023
8. Widen EW, Brangman SA, Chin NA. Ushering in a New Era of Alzheimer Disease Therapy. *JAMA*. Published online July 17, 2023. doi:10.1001/jama.2023.11701
9. Van Dyck, Swanson, C, Aisen, P, et al Lecanemab in early AD. *NEJM* 2023; 388:9-2-21
10. Sims JR, Zimmer JA, Evans CD, et al. Donanemab in Early Symptomatic Alzheimer Disease: The TRAILBLAZER-ALZ 2 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2023;330(6):512–527.
11. Cummings J, Apostolova L, Rabinovici GD et al. Lecanemab: Appropriate Use Recommendations. *J Prev Alzheimers Dis*. 2023;10(3):362-377. doi: 10.14283/jpad.2023.30.
12. Ramanan VK, Armstrong MJ, Choudhury P, Coerver KA, Hamilton RH, Klein BC, Wolk DA, Wessels SR, Jones LK Jr; AAN Quality Committee. Anti-amyloid Monoclonal Antibody Therapy for Alzheimer Disease: Emerging Issues in Neurology. *Neurology*. 2023 Nov 7;101(19):842-85
13. Kristensen N, Nyman C, Konradsen H. Implementing research results in clinical practice- the experiences of healthcare professional. *BMC Health Services Research* (2016) 16:48 DOI 10.1186/s12913-016-1292
14. Morris ZS, Wooding S, Grant J. The answer is 17 years, what is the question: understanding time lags in translational research. *J R Soc Med*. 2011;104(12):510-520
15. Ebell MH, Shaughnessy AF, Slawson DC. Why Are We So Slow to Adopt Some Evidence-Based Practices? *Am Fam Physician*. 2018;98(12):709-710.

# Request for Proposal (RFP)/ Call for Grants

---

16. Álvarez-Sánchez, L.; Peña-Bautista, C.; Ferré-González, L. et al.. Early Alzheimer's Disease Screening Approach Using Plasma Biomarkers. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **2023**, *24*, 14151.
17. Kodosaki E, Zetterberg H & Heslegrave A (2023) Validating blood tests as a possible routine diagnostic assay of Alzheimer's disease, *Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics*, 23:12, 1153-1165, DOI: [10.1080/14737159.2023.2289553](https://doi.org/10.1080/14737159.2023.2289553)
18. Kang J, Korecka M, Lee E, et al., Alzheimer Disease Biomarkers: Moving from CSF to Plasma for Reliable Detection of Amyloid and tau Pathology, *Clinical Chemistry*, Volume 69, Issue 11, November 2023, Pages 1247–1259,
19. Zetterberg, H., Blennow, K. Moving fluid biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease from research tools to routine clinical diagnostics. *Mol Neurodegeneration* **16**, 10 (2021).
20. Ashton NJ, Brum WS, Di Molfetta G, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of a Plasma Phosphorylated Tau 217 Immunoassay for Alzheimer Disease Pathology. *JAMA Neurol.* Published online January 22, 2024. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2023.5319

## Examples of References on CE Effectiveness and Physician Learning

1. Cervero RM, Gaines JK. Effectiveness of Continuing Medical Education: Updated Synthesis of Systematic Reviews. *Accredit Counc Contin Med Educ.* 2014;(July).
2. Marinopoulos, S.S.; Dorman T., Ratanawongsa, N., Wilson, L. M., Ashar, B., Magaziner, J.L., Miller, R. G., Thomas, P. A., Propowicz, G.P., Qayum, R., Bass EB. Effectiveness of continuing medical education. *Evid Report/technology Assess Agency Healthc Res Qual Rockville, MD.* 2007;149.
3. Nissen SE. Reforming the continuing medical education system. *JAMA - J Am Med Assoc.* 2015;313(18):1813-1814. doi:10.1001/jama.2015.4138
4. Davis D, O'Brien MAT, Freemantle N, Wolf FM, Mazmanian P, Taylor-Vaisey A. Impact of formal continuing medical education: Do conferences, workshops, rounds, and other traditional continuing education activities change physician behavior or health care outcomes? *J Am Med Assoc.* 1999;282(9):867-874. doi:10.1001/jama.282.9.867
5. Mansouri M, Lockyer J. A meta-analysis of continuing medical education effectiveness. *J Contin Educ Health Prof.* Published online 2007. doi:10.1002/chp.88
6. Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. CRR (eds). How People Learn Brain, Mind, Experience, and School. *Comm Dev Sci Learn Comm Dev Sci Learn Com Behav Soc Sci Educ.* Published online 1999.
7. Dirksen J. *Design for How People Learn.* New Riders, Berkley, CA; 2012
8. Mayer RE. Applying the science of learning to medical education. *Med Educ.* 2010;44(6):543-549. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2010.03624.
9. Moore DE, Green JS, Gallis HA. Achieving desired results and improved outcomes: Integrating planning and assessment throughout learning activities. *J Contin Educ Health Prof.* 2009;29(1):1-15. doi:10.1002/chp.2000
10. Ericsson KA. Deliberate practice and the acquisition and maintenance of expert performance in medicine and related domains. In: *Academic Medicine.* ; 2004. doi:10.1097/00001888-200410001-00022
11. Branch WT, Paranjape A. Feedback and Reflection: Teaching Methods for Clinical Settings. *Acad Med.* 2002;77(12):1185-1188. doi:10.1097/00001888-200212000-00005
12. Ende J. Feedback in clinical medical education - PubMed. *JAMA.* 1983;250(6):1185-1188
13. Schon DA. *Educating the Reflective Practitioner. Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions.* The Jossey-Bass Higher Education Series; 1987.
14. Ratelle JT, Wittich CM, Yu RC, Newman JS, Jenkins SM, Beckman TJ. Relationships between reflection and behavior change in CME. *J Contin Educ Health Prof.* Published online 2017. doi:10.1097/CEH.0000000000000162
15. Moore DE. How physicians learn and how to design learning experiences for them: an approach based on an interpretive review of the literature. In: *Continuing Education in the Health*

# Request for Proposal (RFP)/ Call for Grants

---

- Professions: Improving Healthcare Through Lifelong Learning.* ; 2008.  
16. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8011054/>

# Request for Proposal (RFP)/ Call for Grants

---

## References on Learning Objectives

1. Chatterjee D, Corral J. How to Write Well-Defined Learning Objectives. J Educ Perioper Med. 2017 Oct 1;19(4):E610. PMID: 29766034; PMCID: PMC5944406.
2. Liu, P.L. & Lohr, L. (2004). Do You Know How to Write Learning Objectives? -- An Action Research. In R. Ferdig, C. Crawford, R. Carlsen, N. Davis, J. Price, R. Weber & D. Willis (Eds.), *Proceedings of SITE 2004--Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 979-981). Atlanta, GA, USA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved March 8, 2023
3. *Heinich, R., Molenda, M., Russell, J., & Smaldino, S. (2001). Instructional media and technologies for learning (7th ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.*