GRANT PROTOCOL

A student’s qualifying exam will include a research proposal written in the form of a grant proposal. This must be completed in order for the student to advance to candidacy.

Some students will write the research proposal in the course of HFRS 450: Professional Writing and Grantsmanship, typically during the summer of the second year. In that case, both the faculty member teaching HFRS 450 and the qualifying examination committee must approve the steps described above. Other students will prepare a journal article during HFRS 450; for those students, the approvals described below will be required only from the student’s qualifying examination committee.

The grant application must receive preapproval from the student’s qualifying examination committee and be written at a level of scholarship acceptable and suitable for submission to a specified funding agency, conforming to the format and referencing style of that agency. Once the student has received an email from the qualifying examination committee indicating the grant is released for submission, the grant must be submitted to the specified funding agency. Confirmation of the receipt of the grant by the agency must be sent to the committee chair before the student will be credited with having passed this portion of the qualifying examination.

NOTE: In the case of an international student who is not eligible for a particular granting agency, their grant proposal can be approved for submission without sending it, although international students will be encouraged to prepare grants for agencies where they are eligible to apply.

Requirements

1. Students must submit the Grant Application Pre-Approval form to the Qualifying Examination Committee chair for transmission to the Committee for approval before writing the grant. The form must include:
   • A brief description of the specific project and funding agency.
   • The Request for Proposals (RFP) of the agency, including any submission deadlines and page limits.
   • A one page “concept paper” outlining the essence of the proposed activity:
     1. Introduction – statement of problem, need, and significance
     2. Objectives – measurable objectives (objectives you can evaluate)
3. Resources required – staff, equipment, materials, etc.
4. Implementation plan – what you are going to do, who is going to do it, how you are going to do it, and when you will do it
5. Funding timeline – duration of funding needed

2. The student should be the primary author of the application, but may collaborate with another principal investigator and other stakeholders in preparing the proposal, as preapproved by the Qualifying Exam Committee.

3. If the student is submitting the grant in collaboration with others, the student must provide documentation of approval (can be an email) from all key partners at each step of the process (pre-approval, draft review, and prior to final submission to the funding agency).

4. The application must be for a grant considered for external funding (not an internal grant) as determined by the Qualifying Exam Committee.

5. The application should meet all of the specifications of the funding agency.

6. If the requirements of the funding agency are “minimal,” the Qualifying Exam Committee may require the student to provide a more extensive description of key components, such as the research plan or budget justification.

7. Grant application materials should be submitted to the examination committee sufficiently before the grant deadline to ensure time for multiple revisions prior to deadline for submission to the agency. Although the Qualifying Exam Committee will do its best to be responsive to tight timelines, the committee cannot guarantee that submission deadlines can be met if substantial revisions are required. If so, the grant may need to be submitted in the following cycle.

8. As a requirement of the examination, the student must revise the grant application using feedback from the Qualifying Exam Committee as requested until it meets the committee’s standards. The application may not be submitted to the funding agency until the student has received an email indicating that the proposal has been released for submission documentation from the Chair of the Qualifying Exam Committee. Receipt of the actual grant award is not a requirement of the examination, but submission to the agency is required. In rare cases, the examination committee may release the application for submission to meet a one-time deadline, but may ask for additional revisions for the purpose of the examination for an application that already has been submitted.

9. If human subjects are involved in the project, the student must follow required procedures. The student may not need IRB approval prior to submitting the grant if not required by the funding agency. However, if the grant is funded and IRB approval is required, and if the student is a member of key personnel for the project, the student must obtain the necessary IRB approvals.

10. The proposal and accompanying approval forms must be consistent with the grant proposal and submission guidelines of the institution through which the application is being submitted, and all required administrative signatures must be obtained prior to actual submission to the agency.

11. If the student proposes to use the grant funding to support dissertation research, the student must have an approved dissertation committee and concept paper prior to writing the grant. In such cases, the dissertation committee will participate as members of the Qualifying Exam committee.
Assessment of Qualifying Exam Grant Application
The grant application will be reviewed by the Qualifying Exam Committee members using the criteria summarized below and with reference to the criteria of the funding agency. When the review is complete, the committee will judge the completion of this requirement as “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory.” If the grant application is judged unsatisfactory, the student will receive a written description of:

1. The deficiencies and recommendations for improvements
2. Date for resubmission (generally 30 days from receipt of the email notification, or another agreed upon date that meets the submission deadline of the funding agency if sooner, and if possible).

If the grant is judged unsatisfactory on the first attempt, the student may receive mentoring and resubmit the grant to the committee. Resubmitted materials must be sent to the examination committee chair with a cover memo that explains how the revised materials are responsive to the Committee’s recommendations. If the student fails to satisfy the recommended revisions, and the revised grant is assessed again as unsatisfactory, additional revisions may be requested by the committee. The student must make all requested revisions before the email indicating release for submission can be supplied by the committee chair. In some cases, the student may miss the intended grant cycle and may need to submit the application in a subsequent cycle. Exceptions can be discussed with the committee on a case-by-case basis. If further revisions continue to be judged unsatisfactory, the student’s name will be forwarded to the Doctoral Program Committee with a recommendation that the student be dismissed from the program.

Confirmation of the receipt of the grant application by the funding agency must be sent to the Qualifying Exam Committee chair before the student will be granted a “pass”. Formal notification of passing all requirements for the Qualifying Examination will come from the Chair of the review committee.
Grant Application Pre-approval Form

Name: ____________________________ Student 95 #: ________________

Semester/Year that you began the program: _________________

Advisor: __________________________

Official Name and Address of Grant Agency:

Working Title of Proposed Activity:

Concept Paper: (One page length, 1” margins, 12 pt Times, single-spacing)
Introduction, Objectives, Resources, Implementation plan, Funding timeline.

Outline of Agency’s Requirements: (These should be taken from the proposal guidelines and scoring criteria and pasted into this document, including page limits and whether the document should be single or double spaced.)

Submission Deadline(s): (It is essential for the committee to be aware of submission deadlines and whether the deadlines roll on a quarterly or annual schedule.)

Reference: (Weblink where official information on the grant can be found.)
This proposal is:  

APPROVED  

NOT APPROVED (see attached comments)  

Committee member 1: ___________________________  Date: ________________  

Committee member 2: ___________________________  Date: ________________  

Committee member 3: ___________________________  Date: ________________
Criteria for Assessment of Grant Application
Repeated failure to achieve a “Satisfactory” rating for any Essential Component may result in failure to pass Grant Application competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS</th>
<th>SATISFACTORY</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Responsive to Funding Agency</strong></td>
<td>All elements of the application are within the parameters required by the funding agency, and the purpose of the project is relevant to the agency’s mission.</td>
<td>Not all elements required by the specified funding agency are included, or the student demonstrates insufficient knowledge of the funding agency’s requirements and mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Overview and Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Clear overview of project, concise account of project goals, clear statement of problem to be addressed.</td>
<td>Overview confusing or missing, or goals unclear or problem not well defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Background and Significance</strong></td>
<td>Thorough review of the literature and other data provide a cogent argument for the importance of addressing this problem, using excellent sources and rationale for establishing the background and the significance of the proposed activity.</td>
<td>Review of literature cursory, absent, or inappropriate. Inadequate sources of information are used, or the background is poorly described, or the significance of the proposed activity is not well established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>An appropriate number of clearly defined measurable objectives.</td>
<td>Inappropriate number of objectives or objectives that are not measurable; or poor or ill conceived research design; inadequate or poorly articulated methodology, or inappropriate analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Implementation Plan</strong></td>
<td>Effective research design, well thought-out and detailed description of the methodology. Detailed, achievable work plan and timeline. Detailed description and justification of all resources including named personnel, equipment, and materials required at each stage.</td>
<td>Implementation plan lacks detail, or is illogically presented; or lacks adequate description of personnel roles, equipment or materials needed; or unrealistic timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D. in Interdisciplinary Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Evaluation/Statistical Analysis Plan</strong>&lt;br&gt;Comprehensive evaluation plan and/or plan for statistical analysis of outcomes to answer research questions.</td>
<td>A fully developed evaluation plan of outcomes which details how outcomes will be measured and evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>Budget and Justification</strong>&lt;br&gt;Budget detail that is comprehensive, realistic, and accurate, with convincing justification and approval from appropriate collaborating administrators.</td>
<td>The budget is comprehensive, realistic, and accurate; the justification is sufficiently detailed and convincing; input and approval from appropriate program administrators is clear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS</th>
<th>SATISFACTORY</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>References</strong>&lt;br&gt;References are appropriate, cover sufficient breadth and depth, use a citation format that is consistent and accurate, and exactly match the citations in the grant narrative.</td>
<td>Cited references are appropriate, cover sufficient breadth and depth of topic, and the citation format is consistent and accurate. Reference list matches citations in document exactly.</td>
<td>Some references are inappropriate, their selection is superficial, or citation format is inconsistent or does not follow prescribed format. Some references are missing, others that were not cited are included in the reference list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Overall Quality of Application</strong>&lt;br&gt;Quality of application is organized, accurate, scholarly, and of solid substance.</td>
<td>Information is presented and organized efficiently and effectively, with accurate grammar and spelling and no proofreading errors.</td>
<td>Presentation is of low quality and disorganized, or grammar and spelling or proofreading errors are present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>Length</strong>&lt;br&gt;Proposal length conforms to agency’s prescribed limit.</td>
<td>Length of the proposal conforms to funding agency’s limit, and addendum, if required, meets the Examination Committee’s specifications.</td>
<td>Length of the proposal does not conform to agency’s limit, or addendum, if required, does not meet the Examination Committee’s specifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>Administrative Steps</strong>&lt;br&gt;The student must complete all administrative steps for institutional approval and submit the application to the approved agency in the required time-frame. The exam requirement is not met until the Examination Committee receives evidence of submission.</td>
<td>The student completes all administrative steps and submits the application to the approved agency in the required time-frame.</td>
<td>The student fails to complete all administrative steps or does not submit the application to the approved agency in the required time-frame.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**