Instructor: Dr. Sunggye Hong  
Email: sghong@email.arizona.edu  
Phone: 520-621-0945  
Office: College of Education Room 423  
Office Hours: Tuesday and Wednesday 2:00 to 3:45 or by appointment

**Grant Writing Seminar (SERP 696E)**  
**Spring, 2018**  
**Class location:** Psychology room 304  
**Class hours:** Thursday 1:00PM – 3:30PM

**Course Title:** Doctoral Colloquium on Grant Writing

**Catalog Description:** Develop knowledge of sources of funding for research and training. Develop skills in writing proposals. Experience the entire grant-writing process, including searching for sources, writing, reviewing, and making revisions.

**Expanded Course Description:**

a. **Purpose:** The purpose of the class is to develop skills in grant writing. Students will develop writing skills, especially clarity and purposefulness, and will experience the entire process, from searching for a competition to serving on a review panel and making revisions suggested by this panel.

b. **Knowledge bases upon which the course rests:** The knowledge developed through the course is common among experienced faculty who routinely write proposals. This experience-based information needs to be organized and communicated systematically to advanced students.

c. **Description of how the course fits within existing programs in the department and college:** The special education program faculty developed the course as part of its expanded doctoral program designed to prepare special education personnel for the professoriate. The course is required for doctoral students in the special education and rehabilitation programs, and is appropriate for doctoral students in other departments and in other programs within DPS.

d. **Target audience:** Advanced Doctoral students.

e. **Instructional Methods:** Some presentations will be made by the instructor and guest lecturers who are experienced, successful grant-writers. Small-group work and peer editing will be used extensively to develop initial ideas and to refine them for a specific audience. Students will email parts of proposals to all members of the class and guest speakers (if appropriate) on Sunday (by 9PM) prior to the date the material will be discussed in class. This gives everyone time to read and reflect so the feedback is valuable to the writer.
Course Objectives:

1. Knowledge and comprehension of sources of funding for research in education, rehabilitation, and related fields
2. Knowledge and comprehension of proposal formats and requirements, particularly Department of Education and specifically, IES, OSEP, NSF, and NIDRR
3. Knowledge and comprehension of the proposal review processes for Department of Education Grants
4. Application of professional knowledge in specific fields of education and research methodology to develop a proposal for an open, on-going, or to-be-opened grant competition
5. Application of critical review skills to the evaluation of proposals written by other students
6. Synthesis of literature, personal experience, and other relevant information to produce, alone, or with other students not in the class or professors, a unique proposal addressing a real research need in a field of interest
7. Evaluation of the appropriateness of at least one proposal for a specific grant competition

Course Outline: A tentative schedule for the class sessions is provided. Actual topics and class sessions may vary depending on the schedules of the guest speakers and the interests of the members of the class.

- Prerequisite Courses: A professional writing class such as SERSP 695m or 695n and at least one research course (either master’s or doctorate level) should be taken prior to this course. Courses such as EDP 560, Introduction to Educational Research; EDP 667, Research Design and Techniques; SERP 556, Research Methods in Education; SERP 590, Applied Research with Exceptional Learners; SERP 569, Program Evaluation in Education; LRC 796A, Research and Evaluation in Language, Reading, and Culture; TLS 605 Qualitative Methods in Education; and HED 605 Qualitative Methods in Education are examples of necessary research courses to take prior to or concurrently with this class.

Text and Required Readings:

Text


Required Readings

Students must read all applicable grant funding materials for the competition being addressed. Please note: (a) For IES grants, you need three documents: Request for
Applications, IES Grants.gov Application Submission Guide, and the Application Package; and (b) for NIDRR grants, you need two documents: Application Instructions and Application Package; C) for NSF, you will need two documents: NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG) and the Application Package. (d) For OSEP grants, you will need two documents: the 325 application package and grants.gov guideline.

Students also must read one successful grant proposal and one unsuccessful grant proposal, along with the guidelines for the competitions and reviewers' comments if available. Sources for these proposals are professors who work in the area(s) in which you are thinking of writing a proposal. Proposals also are available from the grants.gov website or the home page for NSF, IES, OSEP, or NIDRR.

Students must also attend or watch at least one webinar in the area of funding that you plan to develop your proposal. A number of webinars are available on the NSF, IES, OSERS and NIDRR websites. OSERS: https://www.osepideasthatwork.org/resources-grantees/program-areas/personnel-development-improve-services-and-results-children-disabilities

**Supplemental Readings:** Other information about specific competitions will be supplementary readings. In addition, some speakers may provide readings. Students will be encouraged to select a current publication related to grant-writing in their area(s) of specialty. A number of grant-writing sources are available on the internet, and students are encouraged to explore these sources as well.

**Lab Experience:** No lab experience is required.

**Instructor and University Policies:**

1. **Attendance:** Attendance is required. If students must miss class because of illness or emergencies, they are expected to complete the assignment for the class missed as well as to get notes or audio files from other students. All holidays or special events observed by organized religions will be honored for those students who show affiliation with that particular religion, Absences pre-approved by the UA Dean of Students (or Dean's designee) will be honored.

2. **Submission of Assignments:** Because the success of the peer editing process depends on student promptness, penalties will be imposed for late submission of assignments. Each student can be late with only one assignment. Additional late submissions will lower the student’s grade by one letter.

3. **Students Requiring Accommodation for Disabilities:** If students anticipate problems related to the format or requirements of this course, they must meet with the course instructor to discuss ways to ensure full participation in the course. If the student and instructor determine that formal, disability-related
accommodations are necessary, the student must be registered with Disability Resources (621-3268; drc.arizona.edu) and notify the instructor of your eligibility for reasonable accommodations. The instructor and student can then plan how best to coordinate needed accommodations.

4. **Expected Classroom Behaviors:** Cell phones and pagers are to be turned off in class. Students must not check or read email during class. If a student is observed getting email or surfing the web during class (except for assigned tasks), the student will be asked to shut down her or his computer. If this occurs on multiple occasions, the student may not be allowed to bring her or his computer to class.

5. **Policies Against Plagiarism:** Students are expected to follow the Student Code of Academic Integrity found at [http://dos.web.arizona.edu/uapolicies](http://dos.web.arizona.edu/uapolicies)

6. **Policies Against Threatening Behavior by Students:** Students are expected to follow university policies regarding threatening behavior as stated at [http://policy.web.arizona.edu/~policy/threaten.shtml](http://policy.web.arizona.edu/~policy/threaten.shtml)

7. **Possible Changes in this Syllabus:** Information contained in this syllabus, other than the grade and absence policies, may be subject to change with reasonable advance notice, as deemed appropriate by the instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic/Activity</th>
<th>Guest speaker</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jan 11 | Discussion of Class Requirements
Review of Syllabus and Schedule
Review of Web Site for Grants.gov, for IES and NIH sub-sections
Activity: Discuss Interests and Search for Available Competitions | | | |
| Jan 18 | An overview of NSF grant
-program development
-research grant
-searching appropriate competition
- various federal level research grants
PIVOT training: [http://www.library.arizona](http://www.library.arizona) | Dr. Sheri Bauman | Ch. 7 | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Course Topic</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Chs. Due</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 25</td>
<td>An overview of IES and NSF grant competition, - Primary elements - Theory of changes - Application development - Creating partnership</td>
<td>Dr. Michelle M. Perfect</td>
<td>Ch. 12 &amp; 13</td>
<td>Interview due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1</td>
<td>An overview of OSEP grant - Logic model - Leadership/personnel preparation grants - the importance of a training grant</td>
<td>Dr. Carl J. Liaupsin</td>
<td>Ch. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workbook Ch. 22 &amp; 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 8</td>
<td>Program Design &amp; Project Management</td>
<td>Dr. Sara P. Chavarria</td>
<td>Ch. 6</td>
<td>Proposal critique due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 15</td>
<td>No Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 22</td>
<td>Budget building - concepts associated with budget - Personnel - subcontract - travel - student support - research vs training grants</td>
<td>Ms. Marguerite E. Sallet</td>
<td>Workbook Ch. 16</td>
<td>Grant abstract and RFA due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1</td>
<td>Resource, personnel, related forms, CandP - Obtaining letters of support - evaluation partner - Current and pending support - resource section GEPA and other relevant forms for federal grant writing</td>
<td>Dr. Courtney Coffey</td>
<td>Ch. 17 &amp; 18 Workbook Ch. 17-19</td>
<td>Grant Logic Model (OSEP), Theory of Change (IES), Theoretical Framework (NSF), or Grant Logic Model (NIDRR) due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 8</td>
<td><strong>No class</strong> spring break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 15</td>
<td>Developing persuasive grant narrative. - Using tables and visuals</td>
<td>Robin Richards</td>
<td>Ch. 7</td>
<td>Part 1 due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
effectively organizing your ideas focused on the program goals and objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 22</td>
<td>An overview of IRB Peer review Part1</td>
<td>Mr. Mason L. Burchfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part2 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>No Class:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part1-2 Review due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 29</td>
<td>Peer Review Part2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 5</td>
<td>Peer Review Part3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part3 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>No Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part3-4 Review due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 12</td>
<td>Peer Review Part4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget and Budget Narrative due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 19</td>
<td>Peer Review Budget, Budget narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First draft of Final Project due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 26</td>
<td>Activity: Simulated Proposal Review Panels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3</td>
<td>Final Proposal Due: Project presentation (10 minutes or less) Celebration Time!!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Part 1: Significance** (IES; Significance of the Project (OSEP); Project Overview, Project Rationale, Project Goals and Objectives (NSF); Design of Research Activities, Design of Development Activities (NIDRR)
- **Part 2: Research Plan** (IES); Quality of Project Services (OSEP); Summary of Prior Support, Theoretical Framework, Detailed Work Plan with a Timeline (NSF); Design of Dissemination Activities, Design of Training Activities, Design of Technical Assistance Activities (NIDRR)
- **Part 3: Personnel** (IES); Quality of Project Evaluation (OSEP); Qualifications of Key Personnel, Anticipated Results and Broader Impacts, Research Plan (NSF); Plan of Operation, Plan of Evaluation, Project Staff (NIDRR)
- **Part 4: Resources** (IES); Quality of Project Personnel, Management Plan, and Resources (OSEP); Independent Project Evaluation Process and Plan, Dissemination Plan (NSF); Project Staff, Adequacy and Accessibility of Resources (NIDRR)

Note: If you elect to choose a different competition or if your RFA requires different components in an order deviated from the list above, you need to identify each sub-category of your narrative at the time of your abstract and RFA submission.
Assignments:

1. **Interview (50 points):** Interview a faculty member with successful grant writing experiences, grant writing experiences, preferably someone who has obtained a research grant or a personnel preparation grant in the last three years. You may interview your academic advisor if necessary.

Some questions to be included in your interview are:

- From your perspective, what value does our university place on teaching, research, and service?
- How does that impact your grant writing goals?
- Does the university value different types of grants differently?
- How much of your time have you spent on grant writing?
- How many grant proposals have you submitted and to what agencies? How many have been funded?
- Please describe your grant writing process. How do you determine the timeline? How much time did it take to write the grant proposal I reviewed?
- To be a successful grant writer, what professional skills, other than writing, do I need to develop?
- What advice would you give about seeking collaborators with whom to write grants?
- How do you determine the roles of each collaborator? How do you establish ownership of the intellectual property that goes along with grant writing? How do you determine authorship of products that are a direct result of grant work?
- Do you have advisory boards to serve your grant projects? Why or why not? If you have an advisory board, what contributions do you ask the board members to make? How do you thank them for their service?
- Do you have an external evaluator? Why or why not? If you have an external evaluator, how have you located your evaluator? What criteria, if any, have you used? What are the assumed roles of the external evaluator?

*Develop four to six pages paper summarizing your interview findings. Do not simply provide a running commentary on the responses you collected from your interviewee, rather focus on analyzing the experience.* See D2L > CONTENT > RUBRICS for grading information. Discuss things you have learned, ways that you can make connections to your professional activities and goals, and ideas or resources to assist you in developing your own proposal from the interview.

2. **Proposal critique (50 points):** You are to develop a critical analysis of a grant application submitted for funding. Obtain a copy of one successful or unsuccessful grant proposal that a faculty member has submitted along with the panel review result and, if available, the RFA for that proposal (if not available, locate the most current RFA available for that competition. Based upon the RFA, critique the application for its contents, elements, format, and budget.
3. **Grant abstract and RFA:** Submit an abstract based on the format specified by your funding agency. Attach a complete GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION provided by your target agency. Write one to two pages paper summarizing why you chose your targeted program and how the program aligns with your professional goal.

4. **Final Project (250 points)**

Students will conduct a search of Grants.gov to find appropriate sources for funding within the Department of Education.

Students will write a proposal directed toward a specific funding competition. The proposal will be written in sections as outlined in the tentative schedule. Students will receive feedback from their peers and from the instructor.

Students will serve on simulated review panels to review proposals written by other class members and provide feedback using the specific criteria of the grant competition.

**Methods of Evaluation:** Final grades will be based on evaluations from two sources: (a) the review panel and (b) the instructor or an expert reviewer in the student’s area of interest. All proposals, regardless of the competition, will be evaluated on four criteria as described in more depth in the evaluation rubric: (a) the extent to which the content of the proposal meets the criteria for evaluation published for the funding competition, (b) the extent to which the technical aspects of the proposal meet the requirements outlined in all the applicable grant funding materials (e.g., Requests for Proposals, Application Submission Guides, and Application Packets), (c) the extent to which the proposal meets appropriate professional standards for clarity, grammar, punctuation, and typing), and (d) the extent to which the proposal is well-organized and presented in an attractive and easily readable format.

**Grading:**

- A = 315 to 350
- B = 280 to 314
- C = 245 to 279
- D = 210 to 244
- E = 209 and below