**Working Group Update (Please replace xxx with your answers to retain formatting).**

1. Working group name and abbreviation

xxx

1. When did the working group originate?

xxx

1. Leader

xxx

1. Members, position, and their home department. Use this table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Position** | **Department** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. Meeting time and place

xxx

1. Brief working group description

xxx

1. Goals/future products and projected timeline

xxx

1. Update Accomplishments and Products. This includes publications and manuscripts submitted, grants submitted, and products being developed. Use this table (Type would be proposal, paper, product etc; Status would be submitted, funded, published, in review, in development, developed, etc.; Details would be title, relevant dates, PIs or authors, agency or journal, description of product including any applicable links.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Status** | **Details** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. Life expectancy. What is your vision for how long this working group will last? 1-3 sentences if fine. This question is intended to have leaders and group members assess the big picture, face the reality that time and resources are not unlimited, and ask themselves how this research fits into all the others things they are doing.

xxx

1. Evaluation checkpoint. At what date in the future will you take stock of the working group and ask if it should continue to function, and, if so, with what goals, membership, etc.?

xxx

**Example Working Group Update**

1. Working group name and abbreviation

Molecular modeling (MoMo)

1. When did the working group originate?

October 2014

1. Leader

Marty Ytreberg

1. Members, position, and their home department. Use this table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Position** | **Department** |
| Ytreberg, Marty | Faculty | Physics |
| Miller, Craig | Faculty  | Biological Sciences, Mathematics |
| Miura, Tanya | Faculty | Biological Sciences |
| Rowley, Paul | Faculty | Biological Sciences |
| Wichman, Holly | Faculty | Biological Sciences |
| Patel, Jagdish | Postdoc | CMCI |
| Khan, Mohammed | Graduate student | Physics |
| Martin, Kyle | Graduate student | Physics |
| Mirabzadeh, Chris | Graduate student | Physics |
| Johnson, Erin | Undergraduate student | Chemical Engineering |
| Pabst, Nathan | Undergraduate student | Physics |
| Quates, Caleb | Undergraduate student | Biochemistry |

1. Meeting time and place

2nd and 4th Thursday of each month, 1:30-3:30 pm, Collaboratorium

1. Brief working group description

MoMo is interested in using molecular modeling to understand the biophysical implication of protein evolution in viruses. A specific interest is developing computational approaches to predict antibody escape mutations in viruses.

1. Goals/future products and projected timeline

Our current goal is to submit an R21 proposal to the NIH that is due June 16, 2016. The goal of the proposal is to develop and test a computational approach for predicting antibody escape mutations in respiratory syncytial virus (RSV). After the proposal is submitted we will begin to work on generating preliminary data for RSV to submit a future R01 if the R21 is not funded.

1. Update Accomplishments. This includes publications and manuscripts submitted, grants submitted, grant status. Use this table (Type would be proposal, paper, etc; Status would be submitted, funded, published, in review, etc.; Details gives title, relevant dates, PIs or authors and and agency or journal.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Status** | **Details** |
| Proposal | Funded | NSF RAPID: Tackling critical issues in the Ebola epidemic through modeling viral evolution. Jan 2015 – Dec 2015. PI: Ytreberg, Co-PIs: Brown, Miller |
| Proposal | Funded | NSF BEACON: Predicting non-functional mutations in protein complexes. Jul 2016 – Jun 2017. PI: Wichman, Co-PIs: Ytreberg, Wilke (U. Texas) |
| Paper | Published | Miller CR, Johnson EL, Burke AZ, Martin KP, Miura TA, Wichman HA, Brown CJ, Ytreberg FM, Initiating a watch list for Ebola virus antibody escape mutations, PeerJ, 4:e1674-1-17 (2016) |
| Paper  | Under revision | Brown CJ, Quates CJ, Mirabzadeh CA, Miller CR, Wichman HA, Miura TA, Ytreberg FM, Reinterpreting Ebola virus evolution (2016) |
| Proposal  | Submitted | NIH R21: Predicting antibody escape mutations in viruses. PIs: Miura & Ytreberg |

1. Life expectancy. What is your vision for how long this working group will last? 1-3 sentences if fine. This question is intended to have leaders and group members assess the big picture, face the reality that time and resources are not unlimited, and ask themselves how this research fits into all the others things they are doing.

If either an R21 or R01 is funded in the future to develop and test methods for predicting antibody escape mutations in viruses, then MoMo will last at least as long as the funding source. If we are not able to obtain funding within the next year to year and a half then I believe MoMo would either dissolve or switch focus.

1. Evaluation checkpoint. At what date in the future will you take stock of the working group and ask if it should continue to function, and, if so, with what goals, membership, etc.?

A good time to evaluate would be after receiving the reviews for our R21 proposal (spring 2017). We would look at chances for future funding as well as productivity over the past 6 months (papers, proposals, ideas). The membership depends on the research focus, but at a minimum there should be 2-3 engaged molecular modeling experts and 1-2 experimental biologists.