Grant Writing For Early Career Scholars

Part I: Before You Start "Writing"

ACTIVITY 1

1. We are going to use three websites with information about funding. Read each of the calls and discuss/note the career stage of candidates appropriate for each call.

a) *The Shuttleworth Fellowship*
b) *Sonatina grant Polish National Science Center*
c) *NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program*

2. Below you'll see three fragments of fellowship proposals. Read through them and decide which sample matches which call.

Sample 1

Dispositional Risk Factors to False Confessions: Personality Traits and Psychopathologies

In 2012, Pedro Hernandez was brought in for questioning for the 1979 abduction of six year-old Etan Patz. Mr. Hernandez, a man with no criminal history, confessed to the abduction and murder of Patz.[1] However, his diagnosis of schizotypal personality disorder, extremely low IQ, and prolonged and unrecorded interrogation—all known risk factors to making false confessions (FCs)—convinced a lone holdout juror of his innocence, prompting a mistrial in the murder case against Mr. Hernandez. He is scheduled to be retried in February 2016. The potentially exculpatory circumstances of this ongoing case share many similarities with other post-conviction DNA exonerations. In fact, research suggests that FCs are present in a significant minority (~27%) of all DNA exoneration cases. The purpose of this study is to empirically examine dispositional risk factors associated with FCs among a subgroup over-represented within the criminal justice system and among confirmed FC cases: persons with psychopathologies.

Background & Rationale. Psycho-legal scholars have proposed compelling theories to explain why innocent suspects admit to criminal acts they did not commit.[2] Extensive research indicates that there are two types of risk factors: the use of certain interrogation tactics and dispositional characteristics. Historically, the study of police interrogation tactics has relied on experimental methods, producing a large body of science, while the study of dispositional risk factors has primarily employed archival and correlational studies. Thus, less is known about dispositional traits, such as personality. Two such personality traits–suggestibility and compliance–are thought to confer vulnerability to FCs within the context of coercive police interrogations.[3,4]

Furthermore, fewer studies have examined the link between psychopathology and individual differences in these personality traits. Thus this project will investigate whether psychopathology increases the risk for suggestibility and/or compliance leading to increased prevalence of FCs. In addition to conferring risk to FCs, suggestibility and compliance may differentially mediate the types of FCs made by innocent suspects. In coerced-internalized confessions, innocent, but suggestible, suspects come to believe they are guilty, sometimes even confabulating false memories.[2] To date, only one correlational study has assessed the link between individual differences in suggestibility and internalized FCs.[5] The Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale (GSS), a false memory paradigm where participants are presented with misleading suggestive information, is widely used among forensic psychologists in criminal cases involving disputed confessions.[6] Yet no experimental research has attempted to use this scale to establish a causal link between suggestibility and internalized FCs—and certainly not among people with diagnosed psychopathologies….

Sample 2

[...] How do we study ourselves?

Science is a fundamental tool for understanding the world, and it benefits from many open values. Unfortunately, when it comes to studying ourselves – human subjects research – we've failed to translate many principles of openness. I see pervasive challenges and missed opportunities.

Data sharing is one example. An increasing swath of research data is identifiable. For instance, genetic data is a core aspect of biomedical research, but a 2013 study re-identified nearly 50 "anonymous" genomes. Our current approach treats data sharing and privacy as fundamentally at odds – and as a result, we often give up on sharing.

Moreover, studies rarely share data they generate with their own participants – even when it's potentially sensitive or meaningful. This can feel unfair, even dystopian: the US government's dbGaP database holds genetic data from 1.4 million research subjects, almost none of whom have had access to it.

In addition, each study is fundamentally isolated. Participants rarely meet, and they can't connect accounts between studies. Follow-up and iterations on research can ONLY occur through the original study: it is the sole conduit for engaging the participant. When that study ends, numerous opportunities end with it.

Finally, regulatory aspects of human subjects research make it difficult territory for citizen science. Non-scientists have valuable technical skills to share, but a chasm divides researchers and citizen scientists.

What change do you want to make in the world?

I want a new approach to human subjects research that embraces open values – extending these ideals to participants and citizen scientists. I believe this can enable new types of research and innovation.

I want a new approach for data sharing – an alternative to the status quo, where the study is the sole conduit for data. We can unlock new opportunities if we allow participants to manage and

share data generated by a study. Participants can choose to make some of their data a public resource, and we can make it easy for participants to share their data with new projects.

…

Sample 3

The project “Analysis of the concept of a legal person from an ontological and linguistic perspective” fits into a certain stream of research which connects fundamental problems of general jurisprudence with certain ideas from philosophy of language, philosophy of mind and social ontology. It aims to provide a conceptual framework for understanding the ontological status of legal persons especially in the light of new types of entities that are considered as able of holding of rights and bearing of duties. Among them animals (e.g. in Haryana, India), elements of natural environment, such as rivers or mountains (famous examples of Whanganui River and Mount Taranaki in New Zealand) as well as more and more complex corporate agents. There is also an ongoing debate (e.g. in European Union) concerning the legal status of so-called “electronic persons” (AI and robots).

Although those entities are often put forward as examples of non-human and non-intentional legal persons – many legal scholars insist that this cannot really be the case. They argue that there are some serious constraints on how the concept of legal personhood can be applied. They go as far as to say that even if certain non-human entities are attributed with certain rights and/or duties – they cannot be considered full-fledged legal persons or real agents. They point to an analogy with attribution of mental states to certain entities – we may, in fact, speak of some entities as if they were intentional (we can say e.g. that corporate agents want something or believe something) whereas they cannot really be intentional. The problem of ontological status of legal persons, although quite abstract and purely theoretical, bears on a number of important questions about law and its institutions. For example, it helps us understand how certain non-human entities can be held criminally responsible for their actions.

Optimally, this project should result in a proposition of an ontological theory that best fits various existing conceptions of a legal person; if possible, it would provide legal scholars with a test of how to differentiate between legal persons and similar institutions. It would also help legal scholars decide whether certain types of entities can be plausibly ascribed the feature of legal personhood.

ACTIVITY 2

1. Break out Room 1: ACLS CFP Part I
    a. What is the **scope** of **possible projects**?
    b. What are the **allowed expenses** in the **budget**?
    c. What are the **eligibility requirements**?
    d. Do you have any questions on the **language** of the **evaluation criteria**?
2. Break out Room 2: ACLS CFP Part II
    a. **Project History**: In what stage should your project be for eligibility purposes?
    b. **Project Overview**: Should your proposed project be individual or team based?
    c. **Collaboration**: What kind of collaborators do you need and why?
    d. **Infrastructure**: Who are possible collaborators from your institution?
3. Break out Room 3: ACLS CFP Part III
    a. What kind of sources go under a bibliography or why do you need one?
    b. What should be included in your timeline?
    c. **Budget Specifications**: What are the allowed expenses?
    d. **Intellectual Property Statement**: What requirements do they list?
    e. **Project staffing**: What do you need from the people working with you on the project?
    f. Who could write you the reference letters?
    g. Why do they require an institutional statement?

Timeline for Grant & Fellowship Writing

10-12 Months Expected Timeline

Planning Phase

- ❏ Identify the need & consider a problem-solution approach
- ❏ Assess the potentiality of your proposed project
- ❏ Write a one-pager about your project
- ❏ Reach out to colleagues and mentors and discuss your ideas
- ❏ Seek feedback with a mindset to embrace all constructive criticism
- ❏ Evaluate your funding goals

Build logistics into your planning schedule: letters of support, communication with institutional grant offices, communication with personnel and collaborators

Writing Phase

- ❏ Develop a detailed outline of the structure of the proposal
- ❏ Keep in mind the content requirements set by the RFP
- ❏ Work with the grant office to prepare all sponsor forms
- ❏ Compose a first draft of the full proposal
- ❏ Design a budget that outlines your detailed and projected expenditures
- ❏ Seek feedback from colleagues and scientists in the same field
- ❏ Rewrite your proposal by implementing feedback
- ❏ Coordinate with your departmental business office any remaining tasks that need to be completed

Submission Phase

- ❏ Proof-read the entire proposal
- ❏ Review the timeline and budget plan carefully
- ❏ Send your final draft to your institutional grant office for a final review
- ❏ Make sure you give collaborators, reviewers, and personnel enough time
- ❏ Implement last minute changes based on feedback received
- ❏ Check if you submit your proposal directly or through the institutional grant office
- ❏ Submit your proposal to the funder two days prior to their deadline

Sources:

- Open Academics Science Community https://www.oacommunity.org/resources?lightbox=dataItem-kh266904
- Banat, H., McMullin, M., and Dilger, B. (2020). Initiating and Sustaining Student Professionalization through Grant Writing. *Proceedings of the 38th annual ACM international conference on the design of communication.* ACM Digital Library.

Resources for organizing grant planning

- Trello https://trello.com/en for managing planning processes
- Asana https://asana.com

Links

- Funded and unfunded proposals: www.ogrants.org
- Fantastic resources: https://www.oacommunity.org
- Searchable database for global funding (requires an institutional account): https://pivot.proquest.com/

Books:

- *The Only Grant-Writing Book You'll Ever Need: Top Grant Writers and Grant Givers Share Their Secrets* by Ellen Karsh, Arlen Sue Fox