



**College of Education and Human Development
Division of Special Education and disAbility Research**

Fall 2016

EDSE 885 001: Writing Grants

CRN: 81416, 3 - Credits

Instructor: Dr. Peggy King-Sears	Meeting Dates: 08/29/16 – 12/12/16
Phone: 703.993.3916 <i>please email instead</i>	Meeting Day(s): Monday
E-Mail: mkingsea@gmu.edu	Meeting Time(s): 7:20 pm - 10:00 pm
Office Hours: by appointment only; please schedule <i>at least 24 hours in advance</i> : --Monday 5:00 to 6:00 --Tuesday 3:00 to 4:00pm Flexibility for appointments by phone or in person on other days. Please ask!	Meeting Location: Fairfax Finley Building Room 119

Note: This syllabus may change according to class needs. Students will be advised of any changes immediately through George Mason e-mail and/or through Blackboard.

Course Description

Focuses on identification of funding sources, description of grant components, and development of grant budgets. Includes independent writing of an entire small grant, a significant portion of a large grant, and participation in grant peer-review process.

Equivalent to EDSE 745

Prerequisite(s): EDRS 811; or EDRS 812.

Co-requisite(s): None

Nature of Course Delivery

Learning activities include the following:

1. Class lecture and discussion
2. Application activities
3. Small group activities, including peer review and feedback of grant drafts

4. Research and presentation activities (e.g., some guest lectures via Skype or similar system)
5. Electronic supplements and activities via Blackboard (e.g., webinars)

Learner Outcomes

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

1. Identify and describe purposes of grants.
2. Identify and explore sources for grants.
3. Develop a short-term and long-term research agenda.
4. Given a variety of grants, identify those that fit within a pre-determined research agenda.
5. Describe similarities and differences between and among grants, and contrast grants to contracts.
6. Analyze grants' evaluation criteria, then describe how to develop (i.e., write) grants based on the criteria.
7. Synthesize characteristics of grants that either increase or decrease the probability the grant is funded.
8. Given grant components (i.e., parts), describe type of content needed, where to get that content, and how to write content clearly and professionally.
9. Describe the grant budget development and process.
10. Identify multiple small grant categories now funded that matches a pre-determined research agenda, and acquire funded grants from that category.
11. Given a range of small grant purposes and types, target one small grant that matches a pre-determined research agenda, and write the entire grant, including the budget. Optional: Submit grant to the funding agency.
12. Identify one large grant category currently funded that matches a pre-determined research agenda, and acquire one complete funded grant from that category.
13. Given a range of grant purposes and types, target one large grant (e.g., NSF, IES) and develop almost the entire grant, including the major parts of the multi-year budget.

Required Textbooks

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Karsh, E., & Fox, A. S. (2014). *The only grant-writing book you'll ever need* (4th ed.). NY: Perseus.

Walker, H. M., & Pascoe, S. M. (2015). *Foundations of grant writing: A systemic approach based on experience*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Recommended Textbooks

Research textbooks you have acquired from EDRS 811 or 812 and other research courses completed so far in your doctoral program.

Required Resources

Institute of Education Sciences (IES): <http://ies.ed.gov/funding/>

- Note the FY 2017 grants, which will most likely be used in this course:
 - Research Programs for Education Research Grants (84.305A)
 - Special Education Research Grants (84.324A)

Spencer Foundation Small Grants: <http://www.spencer.org/small-research-grants>

Additional Readings

There are two additional categories of readings students will be doing throughout the semester. First, students will be acquiring the most recent (2013 or more recent) research from peer-reviewed journals and other relevant research and literature about their designated grant topics / research interests. Second, students will be accessing websites, webinars, and other resources necessary for finding and writing grants.

Exemplars of the first category of reading is likely research students have begun to read in other courses, but during this course, more (and recent) research will be needed to determine which to use in the grant proposals. Exemplars of the second category are embedded throughout the syllabus and the course. A few web sites are identified here:

GMU Office of Research Development Funding Opportunities:

<http://research.gmu.edu/ResearchDev/fundingsourcedatabase.html> (includes the [Sponsored Program Information Network - SPIN](#)) Dr. Peter Barcher will be demonstrating how to use SPIN during the second class session.

Federal Grants:

Federal grants: <http://www.grants.gov/>

Forecast of federally-funded grants: <http://www2.ed.gov/fund/grant/find/edlite-forecast.html>

Institute of Education Sciences (IES): <http://ies.ed.gov/funding/>

- Note the FY 2017 grants, which will most likely be used in this course:
 - Research Programs for Education Research Grants (84.305A)
 - Special Education Research Grants (84.324A)

National Institutes for Health (NIH): <https://grants.nih.gov/funding/index.htm>

National Science Foundation (NSF): <http://www.nsf.gov/funding/>

Acquiring National Need Data:

National Assessment of Educational Progress: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>

Sources for Need data: <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/landing.jhtml>

National Center for Education Statistics (need date): <http://nces.ed.gov/>

Course Relationships to Program Goals and Professional Organizations

Course Relationship to Program Goals and Professional Organizations This course is part of the George Mason University, College of Education and Human Development (CEHD), Graduate School of Education, Special Education, CEHD PhD in Education Program. This program complies with university and program standards.

GMU Policies and Resources for Students:

- a. Students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code [See <http://oai.gmu.edu/the-mason-honor-code/>].
- b. Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing [See <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/responsible-use-of-computing/>].
- c. Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their George Mason University email account and are required to activate their account and check it regularly. All communication from the university, college, school, and program will be sent to students solely through their Mason email account.
- d. The George Mason University Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) staff consists of professional counseling and clinical psychologists, social workers, and counselors who offer a wide range of services (e.g., individual and group counseling, workshops and outreach programs) to enhance students' personal experience and academic performance [See <http://caps.gmu.edu/>].
- e. Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with George Mason University Disability Services and inform their instructor, in writing, as soon as possible. Approved accommodations will begin at the time the written letter from Disability Services is received by the instructor. [See <http://ods.gmu.edu/>].
- f. Students must follow the university policy stating that all sound emitting devices shall be turned off during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.
- g. The George Mason University Writing Center staff provides a variety of resources and services (e.g., tutoring, workshops, writing guides, handbooks) intended to support students as they work to construct and share knowledge through writing [See <http://writingcenter.gmu.edu/>].

Professional Dispositions

Students are expected to exhibit professional behaviors and dispositions at all times.

Core Values Commitment

The College of Education & Human Development is committed to collaboration, ethical leadership, innovation, research-based practice, and social justice. Students are expected to adhere to these principles. [See <http://cehd.gmu.edu/values/>]

For additional information on the College of Education and Human Development, Graduate School of Education, please visit our website [See <http://gse.gmu.edu/>]

Course Policies & Expectations

Attendance.

For a satisfactory grade in the course, students are expected to attend all classes, arrive on time, be prepared for class, and demonstrate professional behavior.

Understanding you are individuals with full and active lives, who have made the intellectual and financial commitment to regularly attend class, there may be an instance when you are not able to attend. If this unlikely event should occur, it is your responsibility to make arrangements to obtain notes, handouts, and lecture details from another student (it is recommended that you have two colleagues in the course for this). Students who are absent are held responsible for the material covered and assignments due as if in attendance. Please be sure to notify the classmate(s) in sufficient time for them to be of assistance for you.

Students are expected to attend **all** classes, arrive on time, remain in class for the duration of each session, demonstrate professional behavior in the classroom, and complete all assignments with professional quality and in a timely manner. When absence from class is unavoidable, it is the student's responsibility to make arrangements to obtain notes, handouts, and lecture details from another student (it is recommended that you have two colleagues in the course for this). Please be sure to notify the classmate(s) in sufficient time for them to be of assistance for you.

Please notify the Instructor about absences in advance or within 24 hours after an absence. Be aware **any points earned for participation in class activities, during a time of absence, will not be earned and cannot be made up.**

If you need to miss, for any reason, more than two class sessions, contact the Instructor immediately (within 48 hours) with notification of when your course withdrawal will be completed. If you realize after the first class session that this course's requirements are not a match for you for this semester, process your withdrawal immediately (within 48 hours) and notify the Instructor at the same time.

Students must follow the university policy stating that all sound emitting devices shall be turned off during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.

- a. The use of electronic devices that produce sound or otherwise interfere with the learning of others (such as cell phones, pagers, etc.) is prohibited during class. Please turn these devices off or to vibrate before the start of class.
- b. Do not read or send texts during class time. Doing so is not only in violation of university policy, it is distracting to other students and the instructor.
- c. Computers may be used to take notes during class, but they may not be used for internet exploration, to send or receive emails, or other non-class activities during class time.
- d. Screens on laptops and any other electronic devices must be in full view of the instructor (e.g., do not have screen face the wall; do not put cell phone on your lap) at all times.

- e. With apologies for operationalizing the above specific behaviors; if these had not become issues in previous classes, there would not have been a need to be so clear here. *Please respect our limited instructional time together; distractions such as the above impede the quality and quantity of that time.*

Late Work.

To successfully complete this course, students need to adhere to the due dates for specific readings and assignments to be completed. Complete all assignments with professional quality in a timely manner. Full earned credit given for assignments turned in on time (7:20 pm on the due date, unless otherwise stated in this syllabus). Five percent of the total assignment points are deducted for each (or portion of) 24-hour period that passes after the 7:20 pm due date.

The APA format for clear and excellent written language and technical aspects for citations and formatting must be used. Refer to the APA Publication Manual 6th edition.

Feedback on Assignment Using APA Numeric Codes

Throughout your assignment, there are numbers that correspond to the feedback below.

This # on your paper...	...corresponds to this section of the APA Manual Sixth Edition. Please review your paper in light of the APA writing style. Contact the Instructor if you have questions.
1	Chapter 3 on writing style (3.01 to 3.11)
2	Chapter 3 on guidelines to reduce bias in language (pp. 70-76, particularly 3.15)
3	Chapter 3 on grammar (3.18 to 3.23)
4	Chapter 4 on punctuation, spelling, capitalization, italics, abbreviations, numbers (4.01 to 4.38)
5	Chapter 6 on plagiarism and quotations (6.01 to 6.10) <i>For <u>all</u> assignments in this course, <u>do not quote</u>. Always paraphrase, please!</i>
6	Chapter 6 on reference citations in text (6.11 to 6.21)
7	Chapter 6 on Reference list (6.22 to 6.32) Chapter 7 for Reference Examples: All of Chapter 7 provides Reference Examples. You will likely use 7.01 the most for articles from peer-reviewed journals (periodicals) and 7.02 for books and book chapters.
An arrow or phrase (e.g., "CHECK THROUGHOUT") indicate that a pattern of this type of feedback has evolved, and the writer needs to self-check the remaining portions of paper for that error type. The reader is no longer noting every instance of that feedback from that point on, but will mark some content intermittently. The writer should focus on reducing this type of error in subsequent papers in order to enhance meaning and clarity for communicating in writing using excellent written language per APA style as well as accurate technical APA style (e.g., citations)	

Academic Integrity.

Students in this course are expected to exhibit academic integrity at all times. Be aware that plagiarism is presenting someone else's work as your own. Whether the act is deliberate or unintentional is irrelevant. You must take great care to give credit to an author when you borrow either exact words or ideas. Generally, if you use 4 or more words in a row you should use quotation marks and a proper citation. Evidence of plagiarism or any other form of cheating in this class will result in a zero on that assignment and a report of the incident to the registrar. Remember that plagiarism is a very serious offense and can result in dismissal from the University. The instructor reserves the right to submit your work to turnitin or safeassign or similar plagiarism detection services, for an integrity assessment as needed.

Tk20 Performance-Based Assessment Submission Requirement

Every student registered for any Special Education course with a required performance-based assessment is required to submit the (NO ASSESSMENT REQUIRED FOR THIS COURSE) to Tk20 through Blackboard (regardless of whether the student is taking the course as an elective, a onetime course or as part of an undergraduate minor). Evaluation of the performance-based assessment by the course instructor will also be completed in Tk20 through Blackboard. Failure to submit the assessment to Tk20 (through Blackboard) will result in the course instructor reporting the course grade as Incomplete (IN). Unless the IN grade is changed upon completion of the required Tk20 submission, the IN will convert to an F nine weeks into the following semester.

Grading Scale

95 – 100% = A+	FUNDED GRANT
90 – 94.9% = A	FUNDED GRANT
85 – 89.9% = B+	RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BUT DOLLARS RAN OUT
80 - 84.9% = B	RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BUT DOLLARS RAN OUT
70 – 79.9% = C	GRANT NOT FUNDED
< 70% = F	GRANT NOT FUNDED

A final grade of Incomplete will be considered only due to extreme extenuating circumstances; please contact the Instructor.

Student Self-Management for Calculating Course Grade Based on Points Earned on Performance-Based Summative Evaluations	
Title of Performance-Based Summative Evaluations	Points Earned / Total Points Available
1. Preparation* for Class, Participation during Class, and Attendance	/ 7.5 + 3 points for formative assessments
2. Short- and Long-Term Research Agenda	/ 5
3. Small Grant	/ 13.5
4. Elevator Pitch	/ .5
5. Large Grant	/ 55.5
6. Peer-Review of Grants with Participation in Grant Panels	/ 14
Total # of points to be earned in this course	/ 100
<p>Students can calculate their points earned / total points available at any date in the semester to determine what their grade-to-date is. This is particularly important for students to self-evaluate their performance prior to key dates in the George Mason University schedule, such as withdrawal dates with varying tuition penalties and mid-term progress self-evaluation.</p>	

*Includes submission of formative assessments on time. Refer to the Schedule pages.

Assignments

Performance-based Assessment (Tk20 submission required).

Not applicable for this course

Performance-based Common Assignments (No Tk20 submission required).

Small and Large Grants; Peer Review of Large Grants

Other Assignments.

Short- and Long-Term Research Agenda; Formative Assessments; Elevator Speech

RUBRICS AND DESCRIPTION OF ASSIGNMENTS

Preparation for Class, Participation during Class, and Attendance:

7.5 Points + 3 points for formative assessments

Due to the importance of lecture and discussion to your total learning experience, you must both attend and participate in class regularly. Attendance, punctuality, preparation*, and active contribution are essential.

*Notice on the Course Schedule that there are formative (i.e., ungraded) assignments due periodically throughout the semester. Points are earned (or lost) for being prepared with formative assessments for the assigned session.

MINIMAL	GOOD	OUTSTANDING
<p>The student is late for class and/or leaves class prior to the end time. Absences are not documented by following the procedures outlined in the syllabus. The student is not prepared for class and does not consistently and/or appropriately and actively participate in discussions. May fail to exhibit professional behavior and dispositions. <i>Note that course withdrawal is necessary for more than two absences (refer to page 5).</i></p> <p>Any formative assignment due a specific session is late and/or in unsatisfactory condition.</p> <p>5 or fewer pts</p>	<p>The student is on time for class, prepared for class, actively and appropriately participates in group and class discussions, and attends the entire class session. The student attends 13/15 classes (or the proportion thereof, pending the total quantity of sessions). When an absence occurs, the procedure outlined in the syllabus is followed.</p> <p>Any formative assignment due a specific session is completed on time, but parts are missing or incomplete.</p> <p>Up to 6.5 pts</p>	<p>The student attends all classes, is on time, is well-prepared, and attends 15/15 entire class sessions. The student actively and appropriately participates in class discussions, and supports the members of the class.</p> <p>Any formative assignment due a specific session is completed on time and in satisfactory condition.</p> <p>Up to 7.5 pts</p>

Short- and Long-Term Research Agenda:

5 points

Based on your research interests right now, develop a written and visual representation of your short- and long-term research agenda. For the short-term, first identify your multiple research interests. After identifying the multiple research interests, then prioritize the highest interest areas. Third, given your current knowledge about recent research in those areas, identify what the “next steps” in research should be (typically found in the “future research” sections of the research articles themselves). Fourth, given those “next steps,” identify the timeline and logical flow (i.e., this research needs to be conducted first to know information leading to...) for the time between now and your first year after you graduate with your doctorate. Ensure your short- and long-term research agendas consist of a logical flow of how multiple topics that interest you converge in one or a few overarching areas.

For the long-term research agenda, hypothesize your findings from the short-term research agenda, and more discretely develop the topics that extend until your fifth year after earning your doctorate. Project your research agenda as a second- or third-year assistant professor.

- 1) Cover page (one page)
- 2) Identify and prioritize research interests. Describe the interconnectedness or theme/s among / between those interest areas. (single space; about one page)
- 3) Related to one priority interest, identify and describe content from two research articles that signify to you the latest relevant work that you intend to build on. End with a statement of work you intend to focus on most immediately. (single space; about two pages)
- 4) Develop a timeline, beginning now and extending for 5 years, and logical flow for your research areas identified and described thus far; label the period that includes your dissertation and one year thereafter as the short-term, and the period 5 years from now as the long-term. (single space; about two pages)
- 5) Develop a Table or Figure illustrating your 5-year research agenda. (one page)
- 6) References in accurate APA style (one page)

Rubric for Short- and Long-Term Research Agenda

Assignment Components	POINTS
Identify and prioritize research interests	/ .75
Describe content from two researchers; align to your statement of work	/ 1
Given your multiple research interests, describe possible research questions / topics that logically flow	/ 1
Develop a 5-year timeline with topics	/ 1
Clearly depict your short- and long-term research agenda	/ 1
Technical APA	/ .25
TOTAL	/5

Comments from instructor located throughout the assignment.

Needs Improvement	Good	Excellent
More point deductions for major nonresponsiveness to the information requested, multiple writing errors throughout, unclear flow between and among topics, and major problems with articulating short- and long-term research agenda. <i>Earns below 3.9 points.</i>	Some point deductions for omitting some information requested, some errors in writing, some problems with flow between and among topics, and some problems with articulating short- and long-term research agenda. <i>Earns 4 points or higher.</i>	Full / most points earned for components that are responsive to the information requested, clear writing (mechanics and coherence), well-developed logical flow between and among topics, and well-articulated short- and long-term research agenda. <i>Earns nearly 5 points.</i>

Elevator Pitch:

.5 points

Based on either the small grant or the large grant, develop a 2-minute elevator speech that includes compelling elements from the grant. Alert the Instructor at least a week in advance when you want to verbally deliver your elevator speech during a class session; be sure you plan carefully, because some class sessions are designated for individual work time v. in-class meetings.

Rubric for Elevator Pitch

Assignment Components	POINTS
Adheres to time limit	/ .05
Has good posture and eye contact	/ .05
Uses complete sentences and appropriate vocabulary	/ .08
Provides compelling problem / solution	/ .27
Is enthusiastic and seems confident	/ .05
TOTAL	/ .5

Comments from instructor located throughout the assignment.

Needs Improvement	Good	Excellent
Some but not all components of elevator pitch were delivered. <i>Earns at or below .35 points.</i>	Most but not all components of elevator pitch were delivered in a good manner. <i>Earns .around 4 points</i>	All or nearly all components of elevator pitch were delivered in an excellent manner. <i>Earns at or nearly .5 points.</i>

Small Grant:

14 points

Write your small grant (e.g., thousands of dollars) from the perspective of proposing what may be your dissertation research (you are strongly encouraged to pursue a funding source that is authentic and achievable). Because this may be your dissertation research, you should be requesting input from your Chair (either Portfolio or Dissertation Committee Chair) regarding research methodology and your research ideas. Consider that if you submit this grant to the funding source (submission is optional, not required for this course), and your grant is funded, that will not be the time to have your first or first depthful conversation with your Chair about your research.

The following are examples (not intended to be exhaustive listing) of small grant funding sources. Explore any you want; you may find something to apply for that can fund your dissertation research! For the small grant assignment, unless you have compelling rationale to use another format, the Spencer Foundation Small Grant format will be used.*

NEA Grants to Educators: <http://www.neafoundation.org/pages/educators/grant-programs/>

Educator grant: <http://www.fromfailuretopromise.com/K-12--Educator-s-Literacy-Grant.html>

Literacy/library grant: <http://www.scholastic.com/librarians/programs/grants.htm>

Verizon grant: <http://foundation.verizon.com/core/education.shtml>

Lowes toolbox for education: <http://www.toolboxforeducation.com/>

*Spencer Foundation Grants <http://www.spencer.org/small-research-grants>

American Education Research Association:

http://www.aera.net/grantsprogram/res_training/res_grants/RGFly.html

- a description of the project and the central research question(s) and its significance;
- a brief summary of the relevant literature, the relationship of the proposed research to that literature, and the new knowledge expected to result from the proposed research;
- a summary of the conceptual framework, research methods, data collection instruments, and modes of analysis that the project will employ; and
- a clear identification of the Principal Investigator(s) and a clear definition of the role(s) he/she and any supporting researcher(s) will play.

This rubric identifies specific components required for Spencer Foundation small grants. If another small grant funder is used, talk with the instructor at least two weeks prior to the assignment's due date to discuss that funder's requirements and individualization for this rubric.

Categories	Emerging Limited evidence of grant-writing skills. Largely unorganized. Unclear writing and/or development of ideas. Half or fewer elements of RFA / RFP included. Errors throughout.	Developing Clear evidence but needs more polish in specific areas. Well written but some areas need refinement. Most elements per RFA / RFP included. Somewhat coherent, cohesive, and comprehensive. Clearer brevity needed. More than a few errors intermittently.	Accomplished Clear, convincing, substantial evidence provided. Well written. All elements per RFA / RFP included. Coherent, cohesive, comprehensive, and concise. Few if any errors.	Weight	SCORE
Project Summary (Abstract)	1	2	3	x .2	.6
Description, Significance, Research Question/s	1	1	3	x .9	2.4
Relevant Literature	1	2	3	x .9	2.4
Method	1	2	3	x 1.65	4.95
Budget & Justification	1	2	3	x .5	1.5
Personnel	1	2	3	x .35	1.05
TOTAL					/ 13.5

Comments from instructor located throughout the assignment.

Large Grant:

55.5 Points

Write your large grant (e.g., hundreds of thousands of dollars; most likely over \$1,000,000) from the perspective of your third year as an assistant professor. Assume your record of research has extended well beyond your dissertation, your publication record in high-quality peer-reviewed journals is impressive, and you feel competent and confident to be the Primary Investigator for a major research project that is consistent with your long-term research agenda. A full copy of a submittable proposal, per the sponsor's guidelines, will be scored according to the sponsor's guidelines and priorities. Refer to the Course Schedule for specific dates to submit work for instructor review (formative – no points assigned). **Refer to the last pages of this syllabus for the RUBRIC for the LARGE GRANT.**

The following are examples (not intended to be exhaustive listing) of large grant funding sources:

- Institute of Education Sciences (US Department of Education)
http://ies.ed.gov/funding/ncer_progs.asp
- National Science Foundation <http://www.nsf.gov/funding/>
- US Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)
<http://www2.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/osep/index.html>

Peer-Review Process and Final Panel Meeting:**14 points**

Students will also participate in the peer review of these proposals by preparing reviews of three proposals and participating in a final panel meeting in which proposals are ranked.

Tasks: Given criteria and corresponding point values for specific grant proposals, graduate students will evaluate grants written by peers, write a summary paragraph-per-criteria of strengths and weaknesses (one report per proposal), and participate in a full-panel meeting to discuss proposals, determine funding status for each, and write a brief justification for final-panel's decision (one justification per proposal).

Point Values for Peer-Review Process and Final-Panel Meeting:

Task	Rating					Points Earned / Points Possible
Proposal # 1 Review and Report	0	1	2	3	4	/ 4
Proposal # 2 Review and Report	0	1	2	3	4	/ 4
Proposal # 3 Review and Report	0	1	2	3	4	/ 4
Full-Panel Meeting Discuss and Determine	0	1		2		/ 2
Total Points						/ 14

Description of Point Values for Peer-Review Process and Final-Panel Meeting

Full points (4) earned for Proposal reports that adhere to these characteristics:

- Organization per proposal criteria, with strengths and weaknesses identified.
- Writing quality is excellent.
- Mechanics of writing: few, if any, errors.
- Professional tone used throughout. Feedback and Comments are objectively stated and constructive.
- Content written indicates reviewer is knowledgeable about the proposal content and criteria.
- Reports ready on time.

Most points (3) earned for Proposal reports that approximate characteristics noted for full points, but evidence of minor errors throughout.

Some points (2) earned for Proposal reports that have evidence of major errors intermittently throughout the report.

Few (1) or no (0) points earned for Proposal reports that have major errors throughout the majority or all of the report.

Full points (2) earned for participation in Final-Panel Meeting via the following behaviors:

- Preparation evident by having an excellent proposal report to refer to during Panel discussion.
- Relevant and appropriate discussions occur for each proposal.
- Verbal and nonverbal behaviors and interactions with peers on Full Panel are professional.
- Each peer participates about equally in discussions.
- Each peer works toward consensus on a funding decision.
- Decisions made on time; justification in writing provided.
- Logical and well-written rationale for decision provided.
- Written decision with decision and well-written rationale submitted on time.

Some-to-Most points (less than 2 but could be 1) earned for exhibiting most or all behaviors noted, but some aspect of participation needs improvement (e.g., dominates conversation; irrelevant discussion; unprofessional non-verbal or verbal behaviors).

Few-to-No (0 to less than 1) points earned for no participation or no Proposal reports and participatory behaviors are unprofessional and so disruptive as to cause the Final-Panel Meeting to be disbanded.

Schedule

<p>Class # Date</p>	<p>Topic/Learning Experiences</p>	<p>Readings and Assignments <i>WebSites TBD / posted on Bb</i> <i>IES RFA parts match to large grant</i> <i>Other resources identified as needed</i> <i>Below readings are building the foundation for grant writing; more discussion and individualized readings or webinars or web sites needed</i></p>
<p>Class 1 8/29</p>	<p>Introductions Feedback on K&F Introduction and Appendix 1! Overview of course assignments and requirements Identifying sources of funding Developing short- and long-term research agenda (planning before you begin) Readable writing sources Peruse funded grants (ongoing process, including acquiring recent funded grant matching your research interest/s) How to acquire copy of funded grants via FOIA¹ GMU roles/responsibilities for externally sponsored projects²</p> <p><i>Tuesday, September 6th at 7:30 in Finley 119, the Instructor will demonstrate using the GMU library and how to access the most relevant information in the APA Manual. Bring your APA Manual.</i></p>	<p>K&F: Introduction to the fourth edition pp. xi to xxxv; pages 1-3; Appendix 1</p> <p>S&P: Ch. I</p> <p>Peruse Spencer Small Grants: http://www.spencer.org/small-research-grants</p>
<p>Monday September 5th is Labor Day. Mason is closed – no class.</p>		
<p>Class 2 9/12</p>	<p>Using grant databases (<i>Guest Speaker: Dr. Peter Barcher</i>) Finding grant sources for small and large grants Targeting a small grant (refer to Spencer Small Grants; can examine what and who has been funded in the past: http://www.spencer.org/grants) Determining a grant match to your short- and long-term research agenda Reading an RFP / RFA Identifying parts of most grant applications</p>	<p>K&F: Lessons 1, 2 (focus on federal), 3, and 5</p> <p>S&P: Ch. II and IV</p> <p>Search for funded grants that are similar to what you may be writing, and request a copy of one funded grant via FOIA¹</p>

Class # Date	Topic/Learning Experiences	Readings and Assignments <i>WebSites TBD / posted on Bb</i> IES RFA parts match to large grant <i>Other resources identified as needed</i> <i>Below readings are building the foundation for grant writing; more discussion and individualized readings or webinars or web sites needed</i>
Class 3 9/19	Describing parts of most grant applications Analyzing a small grant RFP / RFA Refining short- and long-term research agenda Identify choices for developing a conceptual framework for educational research	<i>Peer-review process on drafts of short- and long-term research agenda [formative – preparation points]</i> K&F: Lessons 6, 7, and 8 S&P: Ch. III Peruse funding sources to identify a small grant match for you; acquire copy of a funded small grant if possible (non-public grants are not available via FOIA) Have you submitted a FOIA request yet?
Class 4 9/26	Developing budgets for a small grant Refining parts of small grant Working toward a deadline (small grant due soon) Ensuring parts of grant match (internal consistency) Targeting a large grant (is your FOIA request in?!? takes 3 or more weeks to receive)	DUE: Personalized short- and long-term research agenda Peruse Peruse S&P: Appendix C
Class 5 10/3	Identifying and describing parts of most large-grant proposals Developing budgets and budget justification for a large grant Acquiring local support for grant	K&F: Lessons 9, 11, and 12 S&P: Ch. V and Appendix C <i>Peer-review process on drafts of small grant proposal [formative – preparation points +1]</i> Web sites for Logic Models³ Webinar on Budgets⁴
Class 6 10/11 <u>TUESDAY</u> <u>Class</u>	Focusing on Need / Significance parts Accessing data sources Developing clear and compelling Need / Significance Transitioning from Need / Significance to the Method part	DUE: Small grant proposal
Class 7 10/17	Designing a coherent, concise, and comprehensive Method part Using tables and figures to communicate and consolidate Knowing what's ethical and when misconduct may be occurring ⁵	K&F: Lessons 10, 13, and 14

Class # Date	Topic/Learning Experiences	Readings and Assignments <i>WebSites TBD / posted on Bb</i> <i>IES RFA parts match to large grant</i> <i>Other resources identified as needed</i> <i>Below readings are building the foundation for grant writing; more discussion and individualized readings or webinars or web sites needed</i>
Class 8 10/24	Continuing budget and budget justification parts Continuing proposal development (e.g., Project Personnel, Resources)	DRAFT of Need / Significance (terms vary) for large grant due [formative – preparation points +1]
Class 9 10/31	Maintaining proposal continuity Self-evaluating budget and budget justifications Completing paperwork required by funding agency	Review paperwork in SEED grant⁶
Class 10 11/7	Refining all parts of proposal	DRAFT of Methods (terms vary) for large grant due [formative – preparation points +1]
Class 11 11/14	Refining all parts of proposal	K&F: Lesson 15; Appendix 2 and 4
Class 12 11/21	Ensuring internal consistency and logical coherency within grant narrative and budget Self-evaluating for details per RFA / RFP	
Class 13 11/28	Refining all parts of proposal	
Class 14 12/5	Electronic submission of grants. There is no class meeting on this date. By midnight, proposals will be distributed to the peer-review panels.	DUE: Large Grant Proposal Due by 7pm EST (2-point deduction if submitted even one minute past 7:20 pm EST on the date the grant is due) Peer-review process begins (Points)
Class 15 12/12	Panels convene during class time Debriefing for the Grant Process Course Evaluations may occur this class session or sooner, depending on when the class is meeting in person.	Funding decisions made by peers as panel reviewers (Points) Funding decision from Instructor will be in your hands within 48 hours after this class session.

Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)¹:

Freedom of Information Act (FOIA): <http://www.foia.gov/>

Making requests: <http://www.foia.gov/report-makerequest.html>

GMU Roles and Responsibilities for Externally Sponsored Programs²

<http://research.gmu.edu/OSP/docs/pdfdocuments/RolesandResponsibilities.pdf>

Web sites for Theory of Change and Logic Models³

<http://learningforsustainability.net/evaluation/theoryofchange.php>

University of Wisconsin Templates for Developing a Logic Model
<http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html>

WK Kellogg Foundation. *Logic Model Development Guide*.
www.wkkf.org/~media/475A9C21974D416C90877A268DF38A15.ashx

Webinar on Budgets⁴
<http://www.grantsspace.org/Multimedia-Archive/Webinars/Proposal-Budgeting-Basics>

GMU Budget Template: <http://research.gmu.edu/OSP/ProposalDevelopment.html>

Knowing what's ethical and when misconduct may be occurring⁵
<https://randed.gmu.edu/research/researchmisconduct/index.cfm>

Review paperwork in SEED grant⁶
<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/edseed/applicant.html>

Partial Listing of References from Peer-Reviewed Journals and Professional Resources

- Blanco, M. A., & Lee, M. Y. (2012). Twelve tips for writing educational research grant proposals. *Medical Teacher*, 34, 450-453.
- Blankenship, D., Jones, I., & Lovett, M. (2010). Grant writing skill building: A business administration curriculum proposal. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 2, 1-10.
- Bordage, G., & Dawson, B. (2003). Experimental study design and grant writing in eight steps and 28 questions. *Medical Education*, 37, 376-385. doi:10.1046/j.1365-923.2003.01468.x
- Bourne, P. E., & Chalupa, L. M. (2006). Ten simple rules for getting grants. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2(2), 59-60. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.0020012
- Bradley, D. B. (2001). Developing research questions through grant proposal development. *Educational Gerontology*, 26, 569-481.
- Collins, R. A. (2005). Grant applications: The art of science. *Biologist*, 52, 17-20.
- Devine, E. B. (2009). The art of obtaining grants. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*. 66, 580-587. doi:10.2146/ajhp070320
- Dopke, L., & Crawley, W. (2013). Strategies for increasing the efficacy of collaborative writing groups in preparing federal proposals. *Journal of Research Administration*, 44(1), 36-61.
- Evans, H. G., Heyl, D. L., & Liggit, P. (2016). Team-based learning, faculty research, and grant writing bring significant learning experiences to an undergraduate biochemistry laboratory course. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 93, 1027-1033. doi:10.1021/acs.jchemed.5b00854
- Fazel, I., & Shei, L. (2015). Citation behaviors of graduate students in grant proposal writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 20, 203-214. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2015.10.002
- Hallahan, D. P. (1993). Grant proposal writing for junior faculty in special education. *Remedial and Special Education*, 14(3), 21-27.
- Hasche, L. K., Perron, B., & Proctor, E. K. (2009). Making time for dissertation grants: Strategies for social work students and educators. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 19, 340-350.
- Hayes, M. (2003). Nuts and bolts of grant writing. *National Staff Development Council*, 24(3), 24-26.
- Heath, K. D., Bagley, E., Berkey, A. J. M., Birlenbach, D. M., Carr-Markell, M. K., Crawford, J. W., Duennes, M. A., Han, J. O., Haus, M. J., Hellert, S. M., Holmes, C. J., Mommer, B. C., Ossler, J., Peery, R., Powers, L., Scholes, D. R., Silliman, C. A., Stein, L. R., & Wesseln, C. J. (2014). Amplify the signal: Graduate training in broader impacts of scientific research. *BioScience*, 64, 517-523. doi:10.1093/biosci/bia051
- Ludlow, B. L. (2014). Secrets of successful grant writing to support rural special education programs. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 33(2), 29-37.
- Porter, R. (2007). Why academics have a hard time writing good grant proposals. *Journal of Research Administration*, 38(2), 37-43.
- Speece, D. L. (2015). A professor goes to Washington: An open letter to colleagues. *Remedial and Special Education*, 36, 112-115. doi:10.1177/0741932514558094
- Statler, L. (2008). Thar's gold in them thar grants. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 40(6), 31.
- Walden, P. R., & Bryan, V. C. (2010). Tenured and non-tenured college of education faculty motivators and barriers in grant writing. *Journal of Research Administration*, 41(3), 85-98.

Large-Grant Rubric

**Note: The specific rubric used to evaluate each grant must be based on the criteria required for that competition.
 However, there are similar components across grants, and
 this rubric will be used in an individualized manner to review and rate each grant proposal.**

CATEGORY	3 (Excellent)	2 (Good)	1 (Poor)	Weight of Category
Abstract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All requirements for Abstract as identified in the RFA / RFP are included • Content is very clear, coherent, and concise; required information presented logically. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most requirements for Abstract as identified in the RFA / RFP are included • Content somewhat clear; required information may be present but flow and logic needs further development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than two requirements for Abstract as identified in the RFA / RFP are missing • Most content is unclear; required information may be present but fragmented presentation 	<p>___ x 1 = ___</p> <p>MAXIMUM 3</p>

<p>Narrative:</p> <p>Statement of Need / Significance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persuasive argument for performing research is strong, convincing, coherent, and logical, and is significant to solving the problem at hand • Provides excellent supporting documentation and references in the appropriate format • Factual information is accurate, and supports the reason for research • Identifies specific need adequately • Statistics for local, state, and/or national situation is properly identified and referenced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persuasive argument has some strong points and somewhat convincing but lacks some cohesive support or logical flow to the research project • Provides satisfactory supporting documentation and references in the appropriate format • Factual information is somewhat accurate and complete • Specific need is partially identified • Provides some statistics that are relevant to the research with most sources accurately referenced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argument is weak and lacks coherent flow and logic such that the content in its entirety does not provide compelling and convincing reasons to perform the research • Provides inadequate supporting documentation and references in the appropriate format • Factual information is missing or has no connection to the research being performed • Specific need not identified or is too vague • Minimal or inadequate statistics provided with many errors in referencing 	<p>___ x 5 = ___</p> <p>MAXIMUM 15</p>
---	---	---	--	---

Project Description / Method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project plan is in a well-structured format • Provides a clear explanation of the methods to be used and the specific goals to be obtained • Describes the major milestones to be achieved with a supporting schedule / timeline • Articulates a strong and cogent theory of change or logic model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project plan has some areas that are not properly structured for the research being performed • Provides a clear explanation for some of the methods used and the majority of goals for the project • Describes the majority of the milestones for the project with a supporting schedule / timeline • Articulates a satisfactory theory of change or logic model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project plan has no structure or is deficient in many areas • Provides no information about the methods used or has vague goals • Describes only a few of the major milestones for the project and does not include a schedule / timeline for completion or does not provide sufficient information on the schedule / timeline • Articulates a weak or fragmented theory of change or logic model, or this content missing altogether 	<p style="text-align: center;"> ____ x 8 = ____ MAXIMUM 24 </p>
-------------------------------------	---	--	--	--

<p>Budget with Budget Narrative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides reasonable and necessary expenditures for the proposed plan • Includes a complete budgetary schedule for the length of the program • Budget justification for all items is provided, clearly linked to the Methods, reasonable, and shows judicious decision making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides most of the reasonable and necessary expenditures for the proposed plan • Includes a partial budgetary schedule for the initial phase of the program • Budget justification for most items is provided, linked somewhat to the Methods, is somewhat reasonable, and shows good decision making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expenditures are unreasonable or unnecessary • Schedule is vague, not within program limits, or has unrealistic timeline • Budget justification for some items is missing, not clear how items are connected to the Methods, questions regarding reasonableness of requests, and shows poor decision making 	<p>___ x 2.5 = ___</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MAXIMUM 7.5</p>
--	--	---	---	--

Organizational Capacity / Key Project Personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicates organizational capacity • Provides a listing of all key personnel responsible for research, management, and oversight for the program • Describes all management functions with information about staff qualifications and experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicates the majority of organizational capacity related to grant • Provides a listing of the majority of key personnel responsible for research, management, and oversight for the program • Describes some of the management functions with partial information on staff qualifications and experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or irrelevant organizational capacity provided • Provides no or unclear listing of key personnel • Does not clearly describe or organize description of the management functions or provide information about staff qualifications and experience 	<p>___ x 2 = ___</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MAXIMUM 6</p>
--	---	---	--	--

Professional Writing and Referencing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written in a professional and acceptable style with no errors • Uses research data that is recent and relevant to the proposed project • Reference section has few if any errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written in a professional and acceptable style with 5 errors • Uses research data that is somewhat recent and relevant to the proposed research project • Reference section has over 5 errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written in an unprofessional and unacceptable style with several (>5) errors; reads as rough draft • Uses research data that is dated, or is not research, and has little to no connection to the proposed research project • Reference section has noticeable and repeated errors throughout 	<i>No points but could lower values in other categories</i>
<p style="text-align: center;">TOTAL POINTS EARNED</p> <p><i>Comments from instructor located throughout the grant.</i></p>		<p style="text-align: center;">/ 55.5</p>		

Rubric adapted from Education World <http://www.urbanministry.org/wiki/evaluating-your-proposal-simple-rubric>