Semester/Year: Spring 2013  
Instructor: Dr. Laura Otto-Salaj  
Office: 1173 Enderis Hall  
E-mail: lottosal@uwm.edu  
Phone: (414)229-3271  
FAX: (414)229-2872  
Course location: HON 180

Course Description
This 1-credit skills proseminar is designed to familiarize students with key principles and techniques for constructing competitive behavioral research grant proposals for submission to various funding entities at the federal, state, and local levels. The course will assist students in the steps of identifying funding sources and submitting/revising applications for research grants. The course utilizes critical analysis of readings, examples, and experiential learning opportunities (i.e., developing components of a federal research grant proposal, collegial reviewing of other students’ proposals). This course is appropriate for social work doctoral students as well as for graduate students in other professions and disciplines.

Prerequisites
Students enrolled in this course must have graduate standing or signed permission of the instructor.

Specific Course Goals and Objectives
The goals of the social work doctoral program include preparing students to make contributions to the profession as researchers, scholars, and educators, through acquisition and execution of funded research projects. Grantwriting is a skill-based endeavor, requiring knowledge of funding mechanisms, and use of strategies in conceptualizing and constructing projects, writing, and responding to reviews. Toward this end, the objectives of this course are to enable students to demonstrate the following:

1. Awareness of the different types of research funding mechanisms at the local, state, and federal levels;
2. Ability to identify and match sources of funding appropriate to the subject and scope of the project the student wishes to propose;
3. Awareness of the overall structure of a research grant proposal;
4. Ability to identify appropriate structural elements idiosyncratic to specific federal, state or local grant mechanisms;
5. Ability to construct a draft narrative of an NIH small grant (R03) proposal, demonstrating principles learned in the course;
6. Ability to assess potential community collaborators for collaboration in applied research projects; and
7. Ability to critically assess and provide feedback on proposals in an informed, respectful, and collegial manner.

**Texts/Required Reading Sources**
- Handout on peer review.
- Other chapters as listed for each week (see content below by week; readings posted on D2L).

**Recommended Texts:**

**Learning Environment and Resources**
Many of the course materials are accessible to registered students through D2L at http://www.uwm.edu/UWM/Student/elearning.html. All students enrolled in social work courses have access to the computer lab located on the 10th floor of Enderis Hall and at other locations throughout campus. For specific locations/hours see https://www3.uwm.edu/IMT/services/campus/ccls/.

Campus policy information regarding participation by students with disabilities, accommodations for religious observances, academic conduct/misconduct, incomplete grading policies, complaint procedures, grade appeal procedures, sexual harassment and safety policies, final exam date requirements, and other standing policies/procedures is available on-line at: http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/SecU/SyllabusLinks.pdf.

**Assignments/Grading**
Student grades in this course are based on the following criteria (full details attached):

- Successful submission of the following sections of an R03 grant proposal:
  - Assignment #1: Specific Aims and Abstract (1 page + 1/3 page) (10%) + (5%)
  - Assignment #2: Research Strategy: B. Significance (1.5 pages total) (15%)
  - Assignment #4: Research Strategy: D. Approach (4 pages) (20%)
  - Assignment #6: Human Subjects section (10%)
  - Assignment #8: Research Strategy: C. Innovation (.5 pages total) (5%)
  - Assignment #9: All sections with feedback integrated (20%) (yes, this does include the Innovation section from Assignment #8, obviously without feedback)

- Assignment #3: Provide written critique of/Feedback on colleague Specific Aims and Abstract section (1/2 page each) (5%)
- Assignment #5: Provide written critique of/Feedback on colleague Significance section (1/2 page) (5 %)
- Assignment #7: Provide written critique of/Feedback on colleague Approach (1/2 page) (5%)
Late assignments will be graded downward for every 24 hours past due (i.e., letter grade equivalents will be in $1/3$ increments, such that an “A” becomes “A-,” “B+” becomes “B,” etc.). University policies regarding the course grade of “Incomplete” will be followed.
Class Schedule/Outline
(each session meets 110 minutes, once every other week)

Week 1 (1/24/13): Introduction, Elements of a Research Proposal, Matching to Mechanism

Project Conceptualization: Discussion of Areas of Interest
How to Determine Whether or Not an Idea is Fundable?
Funding Sources
Matching Projects to Funding Sources
Mechanisms
Requests for Applications/Proposals

Required Readings:
• Friedland & Folt (2009). Chapter 1: Getting Started (pp. 1-14).
• Gerin & Kapelewski (2010). Chapter 1: The National Institutes of Health and biomedical funding (pp. 1-6); Chapter 3: Types of award mechanisms (pp. 15-18, 35-40); Chapter 4: Preparation and preliminary steps (pp. 47-59).

Recommended Readings:
• Ogden & Goldberg (2002). Chapter 1: The NIH and other sources of research support (pp. 3-20); Chapter 2: A Strong Proposal (pp. 21-29).

Week 2 (2/7/13): Framing your Proposal

Introduction to General Proposal Structure:
Introduction
Rationale/Literature Review
Preliminary Findings
Research Design and Method

NIH Proposal Structure:
Specific Aims
Significance
Innovation
Approach
Abstract
Specific Aims: More detail

Required Readings:
• Friedland & Folt (2009). Chapter 4: Developing Your Conceptual Framework and Significance Statement (pp. 35-48); Chapter 7: Objectives, hypotheses and specific aims: An exhaustive list is exhausting (pp. 78-89).
• Gerin & Kapelewski (2010). Chapter 5: Writing the application, part I: The scientific content (pp. 61-79 ONLY).

Recommended Readings:
• Ogden & Goldberg (2002). Chapter 5: The abstract and specific aims (pp. 55-68).

Week 3 (2/21/13): Peer Review, Supporting Your Argument: Significance
Why peer review?
**Principles of reviewing: importance of both tone and content**

**Differences in review**
- Journal articles
- Conference abstracts
- Grant proposals

**Significance:**
- Purpose
- Structure
- Inclusion of Theoretical/Conceptual Framework
- Tone
- Strategies for construction

**Required Readings:**
- Friedland & Folt (2009). Chapter 8: Lay the foundation in the introduction (pp. 90-105).
- Gerin & Kapelweski (2010). Chapter 5: Writing the application, part I: The scientific content (pp. 80-85 ONLY).
- Handout, peer review.

**Assignments Due:**
- Assignment #1: Specific Aims section of R03 grant (10%).

**Week 4 (3/7/13): Experimental Design and Method (Approach section)**

I will be out of town this day, so this material will be delivered online, by video lecture posted on the D2L course site.

**Subjects/Participants**
- Selection
- Inclusion/Exclusion
- Recruitment

**Procedure**
**Location(s)**
**Assessment: Method, Measures**
**Intervention**
**Staffing**
- Human Subjects

**Data Analysis**

**Required Readings:**
- Gerin & Kapelweski (2010). Chapter 5: Writing the application, part I: The scientific content (pp. 90-107 ONLY).

**Recommended Readings:**
- Ogden & Goldberg (2002). Chapter 8: Research design & methods (pp. 101-118).
Assignments Due:
- Assignment #2: Significance section of R03 grant application (15%)
- Assignment #3: Collegial critique/feedback on colleague R03 Specific Aims section (5%)


Week 5 (4/4/13): Human Subjects Research and Grant Proposals

Just-In-Time
Ethics and Accountability
Informed Consent and Assent
Inclusion of Women, Minorities, and Children
Targeted/Planned Enrollment
Certificates of Confidentiality
Data and Safety Monitoring
HIPAA

Required Readings:
- Friedland & Folt (2000). Chapter 16: Ethics and research (pp. 158-162). (Note this is the 2000 version of this book; this will be posted on D2L).
- Gerin & Kapelewski (2010). Chapter 6: Writing the application, part II (pp. 111-150).

Assignments Due:
- Assignment #4: Approach section of R03 grant application (20%)
- Assignment #5: Collegial critique/feedback on colleague R03 Significance section (5%).

Week 6 (4/18/13): Innovation, Budget, and Other Elements of Grant Proposals (Administration)

Innovation:
- Purpose
- How to Address

Other Elements:
- Research Team (Establishing capacity:)
  - Description of Background and Qualifications
  - Choice of Collaborators
  - Involvement of Community Partners
  - Self-Promotion

Biosketches
- Statement

Resources
- Consortia & Contracts
- Consultants
Letters of Support

References

Research Support

Budget:

Conceptualization

Construction

Justification

Staffing:

FTEs

Calculation

Timelines

Required Readings:

- Friedland & Folt (2009). Chapter 11: The timeline is a reality check (pp. 129-133); Chapter 12: References in detail: How many and how recent? (pp. 134-140). Chapter 13: Preparing a budget (pp. 140-146).
- Ogden & Goldberg (2002). Chapter 10: Biographical sketch, research support and resources (pp. 139-150) (posted on D2L).
- Gerin & Kapelewski (2010). Chapter 6: Writing the application, part I (pp. 85-87 ONLY); Chapter 2: Mentoring and collaborative relationships (pp. 7-13); Chapter 7: Writing the application, part III (pp. 151-197).

Recommended Readings:

- Ogden & Goldberg (2002). Chapter 9: The budget (pp. 119-138). Chapter 13: Consortiums, contracts, consultants, and collaborators (pp. 169-174); Chapter 14: Literature cited and appendices (pp. 175-180).

Assignments Due:

- Assignment #6: Human Subjects section of R03 grant (10%)
- Assignment #7: Collegial critique/feedback on colleague R03 Approach section (5%)

Week 7 (5/2/13): Submission and Review: Process

Required Readings:

- Friedland & Folt (2009). Chapter 14: The three R’s: Rethink, revise, and resubmit (pp. 150-155).

Recommended Readings:

- Ogden & Goldberg (2002). Chapter 3: Proposal review (pp. 29-44); Chapter 17: Proposal submission and supplementary materials (pp. 201-206); Chapter 15: Revision of an unfunded proposal (pp. 181-192).
- Gerin & Kapelewski (2010). Chapter 8: Submitting the application (pp. 213-220); Chapter 9: The grant review and award process (pp. 221-241).

Assignments Due:
Assignment #8: C. Innovation section of R03 grant (5%).

Week 8 (5/9/13): Due date for Assignment #9: Combined sections of revised proposal with integrated feedback (20%). Due by 5 pm May 9th

Additional Reading Resources:

Assignment 1: Submission of Draft Specific Aims and Abstract of R03 Project

Due date: submitted to D2L by class time, 2.21.13

Learning Objectives: The purpose of this assignment is for students to be able to 1) develop a summary of their project in abstract form, and 2) develop a one page Specific Aims section of their grant, including identification of research questions, rationale, objectives, and hypotheses.

Specific Details: This analysis should be single-spaced, with .5 inch margins in Arial 11 font, 1 page for Specific Aims and 1/3 page for abstract.

Grading: This assignment is worth 10% of the course grade; the grading scheme is based on the following criteria:

Specific Aims:
8 pts. – completeness (inclusion of appropriate rationale, study objectives and hypotheses, rudimentary method
2 pts – quality of presentation of your points, arguments, and analyses
(10 Total possible points)

Abstract:
4 pts. – completeness (inclusion of appropriate elements)
1 pt. – quality of presentation of your points
(5 Total possible points)

Letter grade equivalents:
Specific Aims:
10=A, 9=A-, 8=B+, 7=B, 6=B-, 5=C+, 4=C, 3=C-, 2=D, 1/0=E

Abstract:
5=A, 4=B, 3=C, 2=D, 1/0=E
Assignment 2: Submission of Draft Significance section of R03 Project

Due date: submitted to D2L by class time, 3.7.13

**Learning Objectives:** The purpose of this assignment is for students to be able to 1) conduct a preliminary literature review appropriate to their research question; 2) demonstrate inclusion of an appropriate theoretical/conceptual framework for their proposal; 3) demonstrate movement toward the ability to construct a “story” demonstrating the rationale of their choice of research question and research method.

**Specific Details:** This assignment should be single-spaced, with .5 inch margins in Arial 11 font, 2.5 pages for this section.

**Grading:** This assignment is worth 15% of the course grade; the grading scheme is based on the following criteria:
- 6 pts. – identification of literature appropriate to research question
- 3 pts. – identification and inclusion of appropriate theoretical/conceptual framework for research question
- 6 pts. – construction of sections moving towards cohesive conceptualization of research rationale

(15 Total possible points)

Letter grade equivalents: 14-15=A, 13=A-, 12=B+, 10-11=B, 9=B-, 8=C+, 6-7=C, 5=C-, 4-5=D, 0-3=E
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Assignment 3: Collegial Critique of Specific Aims and Abstract (1/2 page each)

Due date: submitted to D2L by class time, 3.7.13

Learning Objectives: The purpose of this assignment is for students to be able to 1) provide critical review and analysis of research writing 2) in an informed, respectful, and collegial manner.

Specific Details: This assignment should be single-spaced, with .5 inch margins in Arial 11 font, ½ page for each section, maximum.

Step One. Assignment by instructor of a peer assignment for review.

Step Two. Review your colleague’s work, and conduct a critical analysis of each piece. Consider the following:

Specific Aims:
- Is the rationale for the study clearly stated?
- Is the method clearly outlined in the Aims?
- Are realistic and appropriate hypotheses present?
- Are implications of the study findings clearly stated?
- Is it professionally written?

Abstract:
- Is the abstract a concise summary of the study?
- Is it clearly and professionally written?

Also, consider the style with which you deliver your feedback. Feedback should be provided in clear, concise, and professional language. This assignment will be evaluated for tone in which feedback is given. How can you help the writer improve their product?

Grading: This assignment is worth 5% of the course grade; it represents one of three opportunities for review/feedback provision that total 15% of the course grade together. The grading scheme is based on the following criteria:

3 pts. – completeness and adequacy of analysis
2 pts – quality/tone of presentation of your points, arguments, and analyses
(5 Total possible points)

Letter grade equivalents: 5=A, 4=B, 3=C, 2=D, 1/0=E
Assignment 4: Submission of Draft Approach (Research Design and Method) (4 pages)

Due date: submitted to D2L by class time, 4.4.13

Learning Objectives: The purpose of this assignment is for students to be able to 1) identify elements of research method and design appropriate for their research question; 2) include discussion of how each element pertains to their project; and 3) construct a section written clearly and concisely, and demonstrating beginnings of command of basic grant writing skills

Specific Details: This analysis should be single-spaced, with .5 inch margins in Arial 11 font, 4 pages for this section.

Grading: This assignment is worth 20% of the course grade; the grading scheme is based on the following criteria:

- 6 pts. – identification of method appropriate to examine identified research question;
- 6 pts. – inclusion of discussion of appropriate methodological elements (e.g., participants, recruitment, assessment, data analysis, etc.);
- 6 pts. – construction of sections moving towards cohesive conceptualization of research method
- 2 pts. – matching of method to proposed hypotheses/research question

(20 Total possible points)

Assignment 5: Collegial Critique of Significance (1/2 page)

Due date: submitted to D2L by class time, 4.4.13

Learning Objectives: The purpose of this assignment is for students to be able to 1) provide critical review and analysis of research writing 2) in an informed, respectful, and collegial manner.

Specific Details: This assignment should be single-spaced, with .5 inch margins in Arial 11 font, ½ page.

Step One. Assignment by instructor of a peer assignment for review.

Step Two. Review your colleague’s work, and conduct a critical analysis. Consider the following:

- Does the “story” make sense: are the components presented in a logical order?
- Are all the components present, or are there ‘holes’ in the logic? If so, what are they? Are there one or two, or many?
- Is there an appropriate theoretical/conceptual foundation provided?
- Is it clearly written?

Also, consider the style with which you deliver your feedback. Feedback should be provided in clear, concise, and professional language. This assignment will be evaluated for tone in which feedback is given. How can you help the writer improve their product?

Grading: This assignment is worth 5% of the course grade; it represents one of three opportunities for review/feedback provision that total 15% of the course grade together. The grading scheme is based on the following criteria:

3 pts. – completeness and adequacy of analysis
2 pts – quality/tone of presentation of your points, arguments, and analyses
(5 Total possible points)

Letter grade equivalents: 5=A, 4=B, 3=C, 2=D, 1/0=E
Assignment 6: Submission of Draft Human Subjects section (?? pages)

Due date: submitted to D2L by class time, 4.18.13

**Learning Objectives:** The purpose of this assignment is for students to be able to 1) identify issues of the conduct of research with human subjects that are pertinent to their research question; 2) include discussion of how each issue pertains to their project; and 3) construct a section written clearly and concisely, and demonstrating beginnings of command of basic grant writing skills. Issues to be discussed include: Research risks and benefits; methods of minimizing risks; participants and methods of recruitment; inclusion of women, minorities, and children; confidentiality, and data safety and monitoring.

**Specific Details:** This analysis should be single-spaced, with .5 inch margins in Arial 11 font, unspecified pages for this section, dependent on study design.

**Grading:** This assignment is worth 10% of the course grade; the grading scheme is based on the following criteria:

5 pts. – identification of issues appropriate for student’s study;
5 pts. – construction of sections moving towards cohesive conceptualization of human subjects issues as pertinent to student’s research

(10 Total possible points)

Letter grade equivalents: 10=A, 9=A-, 8=B+, 7=B, 6=B-, 5=C+, 4=C, 3=C-, 2=D, 1/0=E
Assignment 7: Collegial Critique of Approach (formerly called Research Design and Method)
(1/2 page)

Due date: submitted to D2L by class time, 4.18.13

Learning Objectives: The purpose of this assignment is for students to be able to 1) provide critical review and analysis of research writing 2) in an informed, respectful, and collegial manner.

Specific Details: This assignment should be single-spaced, with .5 inch margins in Arial 11 font, ½ page.

Step One. Assignment by instructor of a peer assignment for review.

Step Two. Review your colleague’s work, and conduct a critical analysis. Consider the following:

- Is the method appropriate to examine the research question?
- Are the specified measures appropriate? Do they match up with the theoretical framework?
- Are the participants appropriate to test the hypotheses?
- Are the methods of recruitment reasonable?
- Is the location for research appropriate?
- Is what participants will experience clearly described, step by step?
- Is the section clearly written?

Also, consider the style with which you deliver your feedback. Feedback should be provided in clear, concise, and professional language. This assignment will be evaluated for tone in which feedback is given. How can you help the writer improve their product?

Grading: This assignment is worth 5% of the course grade; it represents one of three opportunities for review/feedback provision that total 15% of the course grade together. The grading scheme is based on the following criteria:

- 3 pts. – completeness and adequacy of analysis
- 2 pts – quality/tone of presentation of your points, arguments, and analyses

(5 Total possible points)

Letter grade equivalents: 5=A, 4=B, 3=C, 2=D, 1/0=E
Assignment 8: Submission of Draft Innovation section (1/2 page) for R03 Project

Due date: submitted to D2L by class time, 5.2.13

Learning Objectives: The purpose of this assignment is for students to be able to 1) identify points in which their research idea and method are innovative and 2) present this in written form with appropriate tone.

Specific Details: This analysis should be single-spaced, with .5 inch margins in Arial 11 font, 1/3 to 1/2 page in length.

Grading: This assignment is worth 5% of the course grade; the grading scheme is based on the following criteria:

- 4 pts. – identification and specification of strengths related to conduct of identified research project (inclusion of appropriate elements)
- 1 pt. – quality/tone of presentation of your points
(5 Total possible points)

Letter grade equivalents: 5=A, 4=B, 3=C, 2=D, 1/0=E
Due date: submitted to D2L by 5 pm, 5.9.13

**Learning Objectives:** The purpose of this assignment is for students to be able to 1) develop a cohesive research proposal 2) while incorporating feedback from colleagues. The goal is to collaborate with colleagues, in order to allow students to create a strengthened proposal. Students should leave the course with a draft proposal narrative, in a form needing only little revision and supplementary materials for submission.

**Specific Details:** This product should be single-spaced, with .5 inch margins in Arial 11 font, approximately 7 pages for this section (not including Human Subjects).

**Grading:** This assignment is worth 20% of the course grade; the grading scheme is based on the following criteria:

- 7 pts. – Provision of the following sections pertaining to the student’s research question:
  - Specific Aims
  - Significance
  - Innovation
  - Approach
  - Human Subjects

- 7 pts. – Incorporation of feedback from previous assignments into the above sections
- 6 pts. – quality/tone of presentation of your points, arguments, and analyses

(20 Total possible points)