

Grant Training for Dummies Working with faculty to successfully submit proposals

Michael T. Marino, MPA - Director of Research & Operations CUNY Institute for Demographic Research, New York, NY

Agenda

- Rules of engagement
- Learning objectives
- Working with internal departments
 - Faculty affairs
 - Academic Departments
- Peer-led training
- Grant development awards
- Challenges & road blocks
- Questions/open discussion







Rules of Engagement

- Speak from your own experience
- Challenge ideas, not people
- Accept conflict and resolution as an opportunity to learn
- The goal isn't to agree, but to gain knowledge
- Nothing is one size fits all





Learning Objectives

- Gain knowledge on how to work within available resources to reach faculty
- Create a blueprint on methods to train junior faculty on becoming research active
- Devise ways to engage senior faculty in training of junior faculty
- Identify challenges in supporting faculty





- Faculty Affairs
 - New faculty orientation
 - Create & present your dog & pony show
 - "First Fridays" or "Third Thursdays"
 - Offer letters
 - Fellowships





- Academic Departments
 - Tailored presentations to departmental meetings
 - Requires chair buy-in
 - Acknowledge past successes and challenges
 - Allow faculty to air grievances
 - Come to consensus on how to move forward





Agenda - Faculty Presentation

- Pre-award application process
 - Identifying funders
 - Private vs. Public funders
 - Fellowships vs. research grants
 - Budget preparation
 - Timelines/deadlines
- Roles of PI, Office of Research, OSP, UDAR
- Approval process
- Internal college and university awards





- Student Presentation (co-led with Doctoral Studies)
 - Pre-award application process
 - Identifying funders
 - Private vs. Public funders
 - Fellowships vs. research grants
 - Budget preparation
 - Timelines/deadlines
 - Writing for grants vs. dissertation
 - Roles of PI, Committee Chair, Office of Research, OSP
 - Approval process
 - Internal awards





Peer-led Trainings

- Funding mechanisms
 - Most common or new?
- Identify potential presenters
 - Who are your top grant getters?
- Structure
 - One hour (breakfast or lunch)
- Your role
- Sample proposals





- Internal funding
- Staff-led summer writing workshop
- Competitive peer-reviewed application
- Interdisciplinary group
- Small working group
- Leads to required external application
- Higher success rate





These awards are part of a grant-writing incentive program that awards up to \$5,000 in a summer salary to eligible faculty. Award recipients work during the summer months immediately following the award to develop a research proposal to be submitted to an outside funding agency by Spring semester of the following academic year. The amount requested of the outside agency is expected to be at least \$15,000. Award recipients are required to participate in grant-writing workshops in the beginning of the summer and to participate in the review sessions for draft proposals at the end of the summer. In-person attendance is mandatory at these sessions. Meetings will take place on the following dates: June 11, July 16, and August 20 from 11am to 2pm.





- Criteria for Evaluation
 - The extent to which the development work during the summer will lead to a grant submission in the following academic year
 - Significance and potential for advancing field of study
 - Innovation in area to be studied
 - Well-articulated plan for submitting external grant
 - Feasibility of undertaking the project
 - Experience and potential of the project investigator to develop the grant





- Eligibility and Restrictions
 - All full-time faculty members are eligible to apply
 - Applicants must have available summer effort in order to receive the award. Salary cannot be transferred or deferred.
 - Those faculty members who received Summer Development Awards in the last competition are not eligible
 - Proposals that have already been developed or are near completion are not eligible for this competition
 - Proposals requiring additional research and that are being rewritten for a second submission may be eligible for consideration; reviewer comments must be included in the grant application packet





- Internal Proposal Elements
 - Application Face Page
 - Abstract, 500 words
 - Project Description, 5 pages
 - Background & Significance
 - Program Overview
 - Availability of Funding
 - Timeline
 - Curriculum Vitae, 5 pages
 - Other Funding





- Evaluations (Peer-reviewed)
 - Scores based on a scale of 1 to 9, where 1 is the highest score and 9 is the lowest
 - Strength of proposed research (significance/approach)
 - Responsiveness to RFA
 - Likelihood of securing outside funding
 - Overall evaluation





- Internal notifications
- Interdisciplinary group
- Manageable group size
- Schedule of meetings





- Prior to first group meeting
 - Proposals shared with group
 - Each participant reviews all proposals and prepares comments and questions





- First Group Meeting
 - Welcome remarks by Research Dean
 - Group Introductions
 - Discuss how group will function/commitments
 - Faculty research presentations, Q&A
 - Guidelines for how to review each other's work
 - Homework: Write first draft of narrative proposal, review each other's narratives and come to next meeting with constructive feedback/questions





- Second Group Meeting
 - Writing Challenges
 - Reviews of narrative proposals
 - Budgets and budget narrative presentation
 - Homework: Rework narrative based on feedback, draft budget and budget narrative, review each other's budgets and budget narratives and come to next meeting with constructive feedback





- Third and final group meeting
 - Final narrative reviews
 - Budget and budget narrative review
 - Putting it all together
 - Homework: continue to work one-on-one with research staff until submission





Part of the Summer Development process is not only to improve your chances of funding but also to increase your ability to think critically about your own work and that of others. You will be asked to provide feedback to the other faculty. Below are a few concepts you should include in your critique:





- Review Proposal As a Funding Agent:
 - Does the application follow all the requirements as listed?
 - Is the language clear, coherent, and understandable to someone outside the field of interest – NO JARGON?
 - Is the proposal appropriate to the funding source?
 - Is the budget reasonable to the project?
 - Are documents organized & formatted appropriately?





- Review Proposal as a Researcher:
 - Does the literature support the proposal and is it comprehensive, concise, and relevant to the topic and aims of the study?
 - Does the question(s) proposed address important issues or problems (Why does this need to be funded?)?
 - Is the proposed methodological approach appropriate, clear, and theoretically grounded?
 - Is the research design strong, insightful, and rigorous?
 - Will the design produce meaningful, significant results that create new knowledge or further research (what's the point?)?





- Provide Constructive Feedback:
 - Have all pertinent information and guidelines been reviewed and integrated?
 - Is your critique comprehensive and directed toward practical application improvement?
 - Is your critique well written, organized, and direct?
 - Are grammar, spelling, and general format addressed?
 - Would you fund this project?





Challenges & Roadblocks

- Unsupportive leadership
- Buy in from other departments
- Funding
- Time commitment





Grant Training for Dummies

Questions?

Michael T. Marino
Director of Research and Operations
CUNY Institute for Demographic Research (CIDR)
Michael.Marino@Baruch.CUNY.edu



