

Research Grant Building and Review Team (REGBART-F)

Faculty Pilot Proposal:

QIPSR is introducing an exciting new pilot program to facilitate external grant proposals by social science faculty at UK. The Research Grant Building and Review Team (REGBART) is a pilot program will provide “teams” of 5-6 faculty with benefits and benchmarks to develop, improve and submit a research grant of at least \$100,000 to a national funding source. As currently envisioned, each team will operate as a grant writing support group that meets about 7 times during the calendar year, reviews each member’s proposal and works with QIPSR and the College of Arts and Sciences to move from an idea for a proposal to a grant application submitted in the following year. Some departments already have the expertise and resources to assist faculty in developing grants while others do not. REGBART is intended for faculty for whom regular feedback on external grant proposals is not readily available inside and outside of UK.¹ The group would also provide a certain amount of structure with deadlines to present and revise proposals. In addition to providing general expertise on grant writing, QIPSR and A&S will facilitate payment of outside experts to review each individual proposals. Participants will also have access to the 2015 editions of *The Grant Application Writer’s Workbook for NIH Version*, and *The Grant Application Writer’s Workbook, the NSF Fastlane Version*.

The REGBART process has the following elements:

1. **APPLICATION INTO FACULTY REGBART:** Status as an assistant professor, tenure track professor, or tenured professor is assumed (post-doctoral researchers may be eligible if they are going to be at UK for at least 2 years from the first meeting of the group). Application can be made by an interested faculty member who will commit to 7 meetings and include the following information:
 - a. In an e-mail, state your name, department, and telephone number.
 - b. Include a brief proposal outlining the research project (a 300 word abstract will do).
 - c. Indicate your methodological and substantive areas of expertise.
 - d. Indicate a list of potential funding sources, and a very rough preliminary budget.²
 - e. Indicate other faculty members who you know might be interested in the REGBART team.
 - f. Send this in to tjanos@uky.edu by **Friday, July 18th, 2015**.

We will then select a team of 5 to 6 people from at least two different departments for the team.

2. **PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL:** Each member of the group would present their grant proposal at various stages in its development to the group. Members of the group would read the 10-15 page proposal and make about 2 pages of comments. It is not necessary that everyone in the group be an expert on the area of the proposals. Comments should be positive and critical, especially with constructive criticism on how to improve the proposal.

3. **SUBMISSION FOR REVIEW:** The proposal when it is relatively complete (at least 4 months before the deadline for submission) would be submitted for anonymous review to 2 reviewers outside of the REGBART. The research proposer shall submit a list of names of potential reviewers. The QIPSR director (and later a separate committee if the work load becomes large) will be responsible for soliciting the reviewers and asking for their critical and constructive comment. The proposals sent to outside reviewers will identify the proposer and also include their vita.

- a. **Internal Review:** A UK reviewer not on the REGBART would do an anonymous review.
- b. **External Reviewer:** An external reviewer in the team member’s field of study would do an anonymous review and would be paid from \$200 to \$500. Ideally, we would like to get someone who has been on NSF, NIH, or

¹ This group may not be for everyone. If faculty already work in an environment where such feedback is readily available, they may not need another group that duplicates what they already have. Also, assistant professors who are going up for tenure soon may not be good candidates for this group because they are usually concentrating on their publications.

² A budget of over \$100,000 is not very high. Take a simple two-year grant at NSF for an example. One research assistant with tuition would be about \$25,000 each year, and you can multiply two months of your own pay (1/9th of your salary if you are on a regular academic appointment) for each year of summer salary (for a salary of \$60,000 this would be about \$7,000 times two or \$14,000). The total for one research assistant for two years and four months of summer salary for a two-year grant would be \$78,000. Adding in indirect costs at roughly 50% would then amount to \$117,000. This is all you would need to make an initial estimate of a budget.

NIJ panels and has recently rotated off (if they are current members, they might have to recuse themselves in an actual panel review). This reviewer would have major expertise in the field of the proposal and would be among three or more reviewers that the proposer recommends. The group would want the team member to suggest such reviewers.

4. **PRESENTATION OF REVISION PLANS:** When the author receives the reviews from the reviewers, the proposal author would then make a presentation to the group on their revision plans. They could summarize the reviews, or they could distribute them to the team. This would be the author's choice since sometimes these reviews can be quite sensitive.

5. **MEETINGS:** There would be seven meetings over the year if the group has six members (there would only one presentation at meeting 4 and 7 if there are only 5 members). They could be as follows:

Organization of Group: *July:* Faculty apply to QIPSR and the team is composed.

Meeting 1: *August: Time=30 minutes.* First organizational meeting of the groups with introductions and an abstract of their proposal. Members distribute a draft or description of their proposal to other members of the group by late August.

Author Preparation: Team members would include the following information in their initial brief proposal drafts: describe the research agenda; identify 2-3 potential funding sources, and identify 2-3 researchers at UK, if possible, and at least 3 top researchers in the field. For a good description of the proposal writing process from UNC-Chapel Hill, please see: <http://www.irss.unc.edu/content/pdf/grantheadout.pdf>

FALL PROPOSALS & SUBMISSIONS

Meeting 2: *Early September: Time=60 minutes.* Two proposal discussions with proposals distributed for reading 2 weeks ahead of time (20 minutes apiece) and 2 short presentation updates on other proposals (5 minutes presentation and brief discussion).

Author Preparation: *October - Revise and Submit:* Authors 1 and 2 revise and submit Proposals 1 and 2 to REGBART review to one inside UK and one outside UK Reviewers.

Team Reviewer Preparation: 2 pp. reviews of each proposal by each team member.

Meeting 3: *Late October: Time=60 minutes.* Two proposal discussions with proposals distributed for reading 2 weeks ahead of time (20 minutes apiece) and 2 short presentation updates on other proposals (5 minutes presentation and 5 minutes discussion apiece).

Author Preparation: *November - Revise and Submit:* Authors revise and submit Proposals 3 and 4 to REGBART review to one inside UK and one outside UK Reviewers.

Team Reviewer Preparation: 2 pp. reviews of each proposal.

Meeting 4: *Late November or early December: Time=60 minutes.* Two proposal discussions with proposals distributed for reading 2 weeks ahead of time (20 minutes apiece) and 2 short presentation updates on other proposals (5 minutes presentation and 5 minutes discussion apiece).

Author Preparation: *December - Revise and Resubmit:* Authors revise and submit Proposals 5 and 6 to REGBART review to one inside UK and one outside UK Reviewers.

Team Reviewer Preparation: 2 pp. reviews each proposal.

SPRING REVIEWS & REVISIONS

Meeting 5: *January: Time=75 minutes* Two revision discussions (30 minutes each) with proposals distributed for reading 2 weeks ahead of time and 2 short presentations updates on other proposals (5 minutes presentation and brief discussion for each).

Author Preparation: *November-December Reviews and Revisions:* Authors 1 and 2 receive the outside reviews of Proposals 1 and 2 and revise their proposals. They then present the revisions to the REGBART group, including the UK and outside UK Reviews.

Team Reviewer Preparation: 2 pp. reviews of each proposal.

Meeting 6: *March: Time =75 min.* Two revision discussions (30 minutes) & two short updates.

Author Preparation: *January-February- Reviews and Revisions:* Authors 3 and 4 receive the outside reviews of Proposals 3 and 4 and revise their proposals. They then present the revisions to the REGBART group, including the UK and outside UK Reviews.

Group Reviewer Preparation: 2 pp. reviews of each proposal.

Meeting 7: *Late April or early May: Time=75 minutes.* Two revision discussions (30 minutes) and two short updates.

Author Preparation: *March-Early April – Reviews and Revisions:* Authors 5 and 6 receive the outside reviews of Proposals 5 and 6 and revise their proposals. They then present the revisions to the REGBART group, including the UK and outside UK Reviews.

Team Reviewer Preparation: 2 pp. reviews of each proposal.

6. **OUTSIDE REVIEW PROCESS:** The authors shall give the QIPSR director a list of reviewers who are prominent in their field. Members of REGBART can make additional suggestions for inside and outside reviewers. The QIPSR director will then solicit the reviews for each proposal.

7. **CALLS FOR GRANT OR METHODOLOGICAL EXPERTISE:** The Team can call for someone to come in to assist them in applying a specific methodology on each proposal. In fact, faculty can write statistical or other consultants in to their grants. The statistics department encourages this practice. However, outside commentary could also come from QIPSR speakers already coming in for a talk, or those invited to come specifically for the team. In the latter case, this could be expensive.

8. **ROTATIONAL MEMBERSHIP IN TEAM:** It is conceivable that after a year when someone gets the grant that they were aiming for, they would then only come back to the group intermittently to help review or give advice on getting grants. New people would then cycle into the group who are actively pursuing grants. Also, membership in the team should represent at least 2 and ideally three departments. The reason why is that the team should not be trying to become specialized too much in any one discipline. In other words, much can be learned from a diversity of reviewers.

9. **PROPOSALS SHOULD BE AT LEAST 50% QUANTITATIVE:** Since this is the QIPSR focused on quantitative methods, the proposals should be mostly (but not entirely) quantitative.