INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+ + + + +

WEBINAR:

GRANT WRITING WORKSHOP FOR YOUNG INVESTIGATORS

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

AUGUST 20, 2009

+ + + + +

PROCEEDINGS

Slide One:
DR. ALBRO: Good afternoon. This is Liz Albro. Thank you so much for taking the time to join us on the webinar this afternoon.

The webinar that we'll be presenting is called the Grant Writing Workshop for Young Investigators. This presentation is really designed for young or junior investigators who are putting together their initial federal research grant application. You haven't done this process before. I'm going to walk you through some of the IES-specific requests, and then I will be happy to answer questions and talk a little bit about the specific process for the Institute of Education Sciences.

For those of you who have not been on a webinar before, I want to remind everyone to keep their telephones on mute, so that we don't get feedback during the presentation, and then what you can do is that when you have questions, please just use your chat function, and type it in. And my colleagues here will let me know when there's a question, and I will pause and answer them at appropriate times.

If, for whatever reason, you lose audio or can't hear me, please do let us know that as well, and I'll be happy to do what I can to make sure that you can hear. All right?

And with no further ado, we can go ahead and get started. Everyone, I hope, has the slides in front of them.

Slide Two:
There we go. All right. For those of you who are new to this entire process, I want to put out some general reminders before we get into the specifics of putting an application together. The first thing that I think probably most of you on the telephone know—but I just want to remind everyone—that a successful grant application, creating one, is a process that starts long before the initial application submission; and remember, too, that putting together a grant application is part of building your program of research.

For those of you who are new assistant professors who are starting your careers, if we have postdocs on the phone, part of what you need to learn how to do professionally is how to create and prepare competitive grant applications, and so part of this process is building your professional skills.

Slide Three:
We have here this slide that says the "Preapplication Submission Process." For those of you who have not yet started thinking about this, although I'm sure most of you have, one of the questions I'll get is people will say, what do I need to do in order to be competitive during this process?

One of the things I recommend to individuals who are still in graduate school is that they strategically acquire experience by taking on more and more responsibility for components of research projects, as graduate students, as you move into your postdoctoral positions, and to make sure that you keep track of what those responsibilities are.

In all grant applications, you will have an opportunity to describe the expertise of the personnel who are part of your project. Some of that knowledge will be captured in your curriculum vitae or in your bio sketch, but some of it, you may need to include in a narrative form in the personnel section. It is really good to keep track of what you've done and how you've increased in the responsibility you have for a research project over your lifetime as an academic.

Another thing to remember is that it's always good—not always—but often good to start small. One of the things that reviewers will look for when they're looking at a young investigator's application is to look at a progression from receiving smaller grants, such as internal grants at your institution, or maybe there are local grants to support small research projects. Then they will look to see if you've played other roles on other research projects. If you're a postdoc, what was your role on the research project of your collaborators; were you a co-principal investigator; have you had experience as a project director?

All of these things are factors that reviewers will look for when they're looking at an application from a young investigator. So make sure that you've got that documented, and that it's clearly articulated both in your personnel section, as well as in your curriculum vitae.

And, finally, and I think for most of you on the phone, you'll know this, you then need to demonstrate productivity. It's wonderful to get grants. It's wonderful to have had roles on all these projects. But one of the ways to demonstrate that you are, if you will, a good risk, that your project is going to contribute to the knowledge that the field is gaining, is that receiving the grant isn't where it ends, right? You receive the grants, you complete the research, and then that research is published. So all of that should be demonstrated in your CVs, and you need to be developing these experiences as junior investigators.

Slide Four:

That's sort of my brief precise of what you need to do before you get ready for an IES application, and now what I want to do is talk with you in some detail about what you need to do in order to put together a competitive proposal, with particular attention to the fact that you are coming in as a junior or young investigator.

For everyone, regardless of your levels of expertise, the first place you need to begin when you're putting an application together, whether it's for IES or one of the other funding agencies, is you need to read the Request for Applications carefully.

For those of you who have looked at the Education Research Grants Application

RFA, you know that it is a 90-page document. It's long. There's lots of information in there, but all that information is important for you to be aware of. Please do take the time to read that carefully.

The second major point that I want to talk about today is the need to build a good team. Most of the work that we support is collaborative in nature. It's very rare for us to fund projects where there is only one lead investigator and maybe a graduate student. Typically, the projects we fund are much larger in scope and have multiple principal investigators.

You also want to make friends with your program officer. So while I am currently the Associate Commissioner for the Teaching and Learning Division, I am also a program officer. All of us here at IES who function as program officers are Ph.D.-level staff. We have all had independent research trajectories, and we are here to help you prepare the best application that you can.

I know when I was just finishing graduate school and starting to talk with research folks at NSF or NIH, I was a little intimidated by reaching out to individuals at the federal level, going, oh, I don't want to talk to them; they're really busy. Disabuse yourself of that notion—not that we're busy, but not that we don't want to talk to you. It is our job to talk with applicants, and I think for the vast majority of us here at IES, we really enjoy that part of our work and will very much welcome calls and questions from you.

And, of course, in order to receive funding for an application, you need to write a good one. We'll talk about some of the things you need to consider when you're preparing the application itself.

Slide Five:

Okay. I'm sorry. I'm pushing the wrong buttons here.

Okay. Again, read the Request for Applications carefully. Why is that important?

Slide Six:

It's important because—okay. Sorry. I've got multiple things here, and I will get this right. I'll figure out what the right button is to push, and you guys don't have to delay between slides.

Reading the Requests for Applications is good, but you need to know where to find them. On our website right now, we have the Fiscal 2010 Requests for Applications, which you can find on the ies.ed.gov/funding page. Please note there is no "www" there. It's just ies.ed.gov. If you put the "www" in there, you won't get to our website.

There are quite a few Requests for Applications that are up there right now. I think there may be seven or eight. Make sure that you select the right one; and we'll talk a little bit about what the ones are that are available. Download the PDF, and read them thoroughly.

The other document that's available at that website is the Grant Submission Guide. We will talk about that later on, but you can also download it directly from there.

For those of you who are on this call because you want to learn more about IES and have not yet started preparing an application for our October 1 deadline, you want to also sign up for the IES News Flash. This is a great way for you to get notification of when new Requests for Applications are released, when information is released about who received awards, as well as information about reports that are released. If you have not already signed up, I want to encourage you to do that.

All right. Oh, now, I went backwards. My computer has a mind of its own today.

Slide Seven:

All right. I have to push everything twice. Okay.

Okay. Sorry, guys. This is the first technical glitch I've ever had in advancing slides.

I did the News Flash, and the next one is the website. You all probably have advanced your slides without any difficulty whatsoever. Here we go. Okay.

The IES website looks like this. If you've not been to our website before, this is what it looks like. There is a tremendous amount of information there. I do want to encourage you all, if you have not been here, to take the time to explore the website.

The other piece of information that may be very helpful for investigators new to the IES process is to look at the Programs and Projects page within the National Center for Education Research or the National Center for Special Education Research. You can find abstracts of funded projects there, and that can be very helpful in thinking about the scope of work that you're proposing, proposing to propose, thinking about proposing.

Slide Eight:

Okay. It's just slow. Sorry. Okay.

For those of you who have not been on the Grants.gov application site, if you haven't looked at it, this is what it looks like. The full Application Packages are available. They were posted on August 3. You want to make sure that you download the package for October 1—that's the deadline—and not for the June deadline.

Slide Nine:

Okay. Hopefully, by now, you know where the Requests for Applications are.

You know where you can get the Application Packages on Grants.gov, and so what you need to do as an investigator at this point is to identify what is the appropriate research program to which I should apply, given the questions that I currently have.

As I said, review the RFAs that are available. Review the project abstracts that are posted on our website, and reach out to IES program officers who can help you think through your project and the questions that you'd like to ask and where a good home might be for your project.

Slide Ten:

Okay. And what are our current research grant programs? The primary research programs are the Education Research Grant Program and the Special Education Research Grant Program. These are located within the National Center for Education Research and the National Center for Special Education Research.

The bulk of the presentation is going to focus on talking about the requirements and expectations for these particular programs. However, I did want to make sure that you all were aware that we also have other research grant programs that may or may not be of interest to you.

We compete National and Development Centers within both of our Centers here at IES. These are large 5-year projects focused on a particular problem that the Institute has set out as something that needs addressing. They are typically larger in scope. If you're at a university that is thinking about putting in an application for one of the current competitions, this might be a great way for a young investigator to take part in a larger research effort and start to develop your skills and expertise in grant application preparation.

We have a program focused on Statistical and Research Methodology in Education. Those applications were due in our June deadline, I think. Actually, I can't remember at the moment. I don't think that is currently available, but if you are interested in questions of statistical and research methodology in education, you should be aware of that program, and you should go ahead and pull that Request for Application. Our next deadline for that will probably be next June, but that's plenty of time for you to think about developing a good proposal for that.

We also have a program focused on the Evaluation of State and Local Education Programs and Policies. This is a larger program of research where states and districts may have policies that they are implementing. They would very much like to have the effects of those policies evaluated, but the states and districts don't have sufficient capacity to carry out that work, and so this is an opportunity for states and districts to partner with researchers and request funds to support their research piece of the implementation of a program.

We also have two new research initiatives that were announced in the late spring, early summer. One is the Reading for Understanding Research Initiative, which is a call

for networks of teams to come together to tackle the challenge of providing reading instruction that supports understanding across the prekindergarten to twelfth grade span, and we also have a Chronically Low-Performing Schools Research Initiative, which is asking researchers to identify two problems in chronically low-performing schools, two practices which address those challenges, and then to implement and test those.

There's a wide range of programs, but if you are new at the research grant process, I would recommend that you start with our Education and Special Education Research Grant Programs.

I want to let everyone know that I'm going to talk about those two together. The requirements in terms of the research goals and the topics are highly overlapping. The main differences have to do with the populations of interest within the Education and Special Education Programs.

Slide Eleven:

Okay. For those of you who want the CFDA numbers, that's the 84.305A. That is an important number to know in the Grants.gov process when you are trying to pull down the correct application package. If you are interested in the Special Education Research Grant Program, 84.324A is the number you need to know.

Slide Twelve:

Within both of those RFAs, there are multiple topics that researchers could apply to. Sometimes one of the hardest things for applicants to do is to identify what is the appropriate topic within our larger research program for the projects they wish to propose.

Slide Thirteen:

Let me just give you a description of the topics that are available, and then we can talk about some of the challenges in trying to figure out what the right home is.

Within the National Center for Education Research, we have broad topic areas in reading and writing and in mathematics and science education. These are topics focused on how do we build proficient readers, proficient writers, proficient mathematics learners, and proficient science learners; what are the curriculum materials we need to have—I'm trying to think—what's the content that should be instructed. There's a range of different questions within that.

We have a program focused on cognition and student learning. This particular topic is directed for cognitive scientists, cognitive psychologists, other individuals with expertise in the world of cognition who have historically carried out research on learning in the context of controlled laboratory settings who haven't taken what we've learned in the area of cognitive science and translated it or attempted to translate it into work in the school context; and this topic area provides a call for individuals to do that.

We have a topic focused on the social and behavioral context for academic learning. If you're interested in things like how to support attention through, perhaps,

classroom management strategies, or if you're interested in reducing negative or aggressive behaviors in the context of schools, this would be a topic area that might be appropriate for you.

We have two topics on teacher quality: one focused on preparing, or working with teachers in the areas of reading and writing; the other focused on providing professional development for teachers in the area of mathematics and science.

We also invite applications in the area of education leadership. For applicants who are interested in understanding better how to support the development of education leaders, we have a topic focused on that.

For individuals interested in questions at the systems level, interested in questions of policy and finance—perhaps individuals who come with a sociological or economics background—education policy, finance, and systems is a topic area that may be of interest to you.

Slide Fourteen:

We also have a topic on early childhood programs and practices. Unlike, say, our reading and writing or mathematics and science topics, the early childhood programs and policies topic invites applications focused on early childhood, but also invites the development and evaluation of curriculum materials that are comprehensive in nature, that incorporate reading and writing, math and science, as well as perhaps social and behavioral aspects of classroom organization. We also invite within the early childhood programs and policies topic an examination of policies around early childhood education.

We have a topic particularly addressing the needs and concerns of English-language learners. If that is of interest to you, we invite applications in that area.

We also have an area in middle and high school reform that is specific, where we specifically request that investigators address questions of changing the organization of middle and high school. It's really not focused specifically on curricular areas or curricular areas independently, but it could be something like changing the scheduling of middle and high school, looking at providing different forms of transition mechanisms between middle and high school. Those are just two possible examples of the kinds of research questions that could be addressed there.

We have a topic in interventions for struggling adolescent and adult readers and writers. This particular topic area is really meant to address the learning needs of individuals who fit or who fall between the cracks. Right? These are learners who are not served by special education services but who are reading two or more grade levels below the grade level at which they are at and who need additional assistance. The hope here is that applicants will propose to develop and evaluate interventions that are really targeting this particular narrow band of learners, as opposed to all readers and writers.

We have a program looking at postsecondary education for the postsecondary

component. The interest that the Institute really has here are on things like access to postsecondary education, retention in postsecondary education, and moving to matriculation to graduating from--to receiving a degree in education.

And, finally, for those of you who are interested in developing and evaluating education technology, we have research topics that are focused on or call for applications focused on the development and evaluation of education technology.

Slide Fifteen:

Within the National Center for Special Education Research, we have a parallel set of topics, again, focused specifically on individuals who have been identified as having a disability or at risk for developing a disability.

We have within the early intervention and early childhood special education topic—one of the things that is important to note is that we include research here in birth to 3, zero to 3 years of age. That is not true within the National Center for Education Research. Our Early Childhood Initiative begins with 3-year-olds. If you're interested in working with very young children, you must apply under the National Center for Special Education Research.

We have a program focused on reading, writing, and language development, again, focused on providing instructional support to students who are identified as at risk for delays in reading, writing, and language development; again, a program in mathematics and science education; programs looking at social and behavioral outcomes to support learning.

A topic that's unique to special education are these transition outcomes for special education secondary students. For those of you within the special education arena, you know that states are required to provide services to students through the age of 21—special education students through the age of 21. But after they turn 21, they don't have school-based services any longer, even though many of these individuals may have additional learning needs.

One of the real questions for the special education community is, how do you provide appropriate transition support to individuals who may not be going into postsecondary education but who may have needs that will continue beyond school? There's a good need for research in that area as well.

Slide Sixteen:

As in the National Center for Education Research, we have a topic focused on cognition and student learning, here looking particularly at special education population, and how do we bring what we know from cognitive science around learning to support learning in the context of schools. Teacher quality—again, how do we provide professional development support for teachers who are working with special education students?

Related services is a separate topic for the special ed community. Here the focus is really on lots of the surround support, support structures that are provided for students with special needs—speech language pathologists or occupational therapists. I'm trying to think of other good examples. Those are the two that jump to mind immediately. How do we provide appropriate supports for those individuals?

Understanding how systems work to provide services for special education students. What are the policies that are in place at the local, at the district, at the state level to provide support for special education students? Are those effective strategies? Are there ways that we could do that better? There are opportunities to look at those questions within that topic.

And, finally, we have a topic specifically addressing autism; and if individuals on the phone are interested in understanding how to provide support to students on the autism spectrum, there is a research topic that is specifically focused on that particular body of learners.

I had a question earlier that I would like to address now, before I move to the next slide. We have a question referring to Grants.gov. It says: ***"I am registered at a university outside my state. I work in a university in another state. Does it matter at which university I apply?"***

I believe that it probably doesn't matter from the Institute's perspective. However, it probably does matter from the university's perspective. Because often what happens when you apply for a grant is that you are looking for salary support; you want to think about where you would like to work and where you have the support for further work.

If you're a graduate student at a university and you're not intending to continue to work there when you complete your degree, you may find that the rules of the university prevent you from putting in an application as a principal investigator if you're a student.

If, on the other hand, you're working at an institution—say you're an adjunct faculty member at another institution and you intend to continue working there—then the Sponsored Projects Office may be able to help support you in putting an application together.

That's the kind of question I'd be happy to deal with offline at another time, where we can sort of talk a little bit more about your particular situation. But I would encourage you to talk with your Sponsored Projects Office. They can help you—or offices—they can help you understand the ramifications for putting in an application through one institution or the other. Okay?

Slide Seventeen:

All right. I hope for those of you on the phone who haven't looked at the Requests for Applications yet, you are starting to think about what research topic makes sense. Sometimes you'll need to make a call: Is reading and writing the appropriate topic for me,

or should I come in under the interventions for struggling adolescent readers and writers?

Teacher quality. Reading and writing. In reading and writing, we also get a lot of phone calls from researchers who are trying to identify what is the right home. Of course, we are working with teachers, but we're developing a curriculum; you have to make a call about what is the primary focus of the research project that you are seeking to get support to do. That's one issue that you need to do in preparing an application.

The second piece is then to identify the appropriate research goal that you are going to write an application to receive funding for. The Institute is a little bit different from other funding agencies in that we have laid out a developmental structure, if you will, for applicants to think through and to make a decision about what—I was going to say "stage"; I'm not sure if "stage" is the word I want to use—but where you are in the trajectory of your research program.

Slide Eighteen:

How do you determine what goal is right for you?

We have five research goals. In Goal 1, you would propose a project designed to explore the programs, practices, or malleable factors associated with better student outcomes. This is really a project where you are not entirely sure what are the factors that you would want to attempt in developing an intervention. You maybe have some ideas. You've looked at maybe some good teachers in classrooms, and you have some ideas about what the things are that you want to put in your intervention, but you don't have lots of data for that. A Goal 1 is perhaps the right place for you to start.

If, however, you already have a pretty good theoretical and empirical foundation for an intervention that you are proposing to develop, say, let's take the social and behavioral example. Say you're interested in classroom management, and you want to do classroom management—research on classroom management strategies in the middle schools, and you have observed teachers and classroom organization, and you know that five factors are really important, and you have a set of tools and strategies you think you are ready to develop; then you would come in for a Goal 2, and you would say I am seeking support to help me bring my ideas to reality, if you were to create a new intervention that has all of the pieces that it would need to be ready to be tested in the next goal, which is a Goal 3.

For Goal 3, the purpose of Goal 3 is to evaluate the efficacy of already developed interventions. Perhaps for your dissertation, what you did is you developed a new intervention, and you got some pilot data through your dissertation, where let's say you were working on a preschool math curriculum and you developed the materials. And you've tested it, but you only did it with one classroom or maybe two classrooms of students. And now what you'd really like to do is evaluate whether this intervention can work to improve students' math performance or premathematics performance across a larger number of classrooms or schools; then you would propose to come in, in Goal 3, under Goal 3.

Perhaps you are interested in doing evaluation of the impact of interventions implemented at scale. There are sort of two ways to come into a Goal 4 application. The one is that you have developed your own intervention. You have evaluated the efficacy of that intervention over more than one study, and you feel like you now have an accumulation of evidence that the intervention looks like it's working to support student performance, and you'd now like to test the impact of that intervention at scale.

Another way to come at this is if you are aware of curricula that are being used in schools that do not have lots of evidence supporting their effectiveness, you could propose to come in with a Goal 4 application to look at the effects of those curricula that are already being implemented at scale.

Given that right now I'm talking, presumably, with young investigators on the other end there, Goal 4 applications are not where I generally recommend researchers to begin if you are at the beginning of your career. These are large, 5-year, $1.2 million a year; and, typically, you would need to have had an accumulation of documented experience to show that you are capable of managing a project of this size and scope. That's often not true for junior investigators—not always, but often.

And for Goal 5, we have a goal to develop and/or validate measurement tools. Measurement tools are important throughout Goals 1, 2, 3, and 4. If you are a psychometrician or someone who is interested in the development of measurement tools and you would like some funding to focus specifically on developing those tools, then you could apply under Goal 5 to develop and/or validate measurement tools. Okay?

Slide Nineteen:

A reminder here, proposing a smaller project often makes sense for junior investigators without long histories of managing research grants.

One of the things to consider, particularly if you're coming in with a small team or with a team of junior investigators, is to think about the scope of work that makes sense given your prior history. Smaller is often better. Okay?

Here I wanted to just answer this question that I think I prompted in my earlier answer. It says: ***"Does IES award grants to nonprofits without a university partner?"***

And the answer is yes. IES actually does not have restrictions in terms of the type of applicant from which we will accept applications. The language in the RFA says that IES will consider applications from individuals or institutions with experience in carrying out the kind of research that the Institute funds. That includes universities. It includes not-for-profits. It also includes for-profits. If you have appropriate experience relevant to the kind of research you are proposing to do, you can come in either under the auspices of a not-for-profit or a nonprofit, as well as a university.

Slide Twenty:

Here we give you all a little bit more elaboration of each of the goals, so that you have a sense of what these goals are. One of the things that you will note is that you may think, well, how do I pick one of these goals? You may say, well, I am kind of between the goals, or I want to do both.

One of the things that the Institute requires is that you narrow the scope of your project so that it fits within the requirements of one of the five goals. Applications cannot be for a Goal 1 and a Goal 2. They must be for one or the other.

Under Goal 1, the purpose of Goal 1 is exploration. As I stated earlier, the purpose is to explore education programs, practices, and malleable factors that are associated with better student learning and achievement outcomes. This is really in many ways a hypothesis-generation stage where you're trying to think about what pieces might go together.

We have in RFA laid out three possible analytic techniques that can be used. These should not be understood to be exhaustive. These are just the three examples that we think captures much of the kind of work that can be done under Goal 1.

The first is to propose to do a secondary analysis of a currently existing longitudinal data set. This data set could be one that is, say, the National Center for Education Statistics has. They have many longitudinal data sets that are available. It could be a state- or district-level data set that you could get access to, to examine questions of particular interest to that district. It could, in fact, be a longitudinal data set that you or your colleagues collected in another research project where there are additional questions to be answered through analysis of that data set. Those are some possible kinds of studies.

You could also carry out, or propose to carry out, small descriptive studies where you are trying to get some primary data, some original data, about how the instructional practices in the classroom are related to student outcomes, and to try to discriminate between the practices that seem to be important for supporting student achievement and those which seem to be less important or not important.

Finally, you can also propose to use a meta-analytic technique where you're not trying to answer questions of what works or what doesn't work. But you're trying to look across several published studies to see if, indeed, you can identify factors that perhaps were not the primary factors of the original papers that you're looking at, but that when you read across the papers, it appears that these factors are important to supporting student success.

You can propose to do one of these three techniques, or you could propose to do two or perhaps three. You have to think about time.

Slide Twenty-one:

For secondary data analysis or meta-analysis projects only, where all you're

proposing to do is secondary data analysis or meta-analysis, you can request that $100,000 to $350,000 per year total cost, direct plus indirect, and you can request up to two years of funding.

If you are proposing to do primary data collection, you may request up to 4 years' worth of funding, and you may request up to $400,000 per year.

I realize I just said something that I actually want to take back, or I want to reframe. I said you can request up to $400,000 per year. Please note that these are actually ranges, and they are not fixed. So that upper range is a typical--the upper number is a typical amount that one might see. However, there are certainly cases where people have requested and received larger amounts of funds. However, what you need to do is make sure that you explain why you would need that. For young investigators, however, I do not recommend that you go for the most amount of money that you can ask unless there's a very good reason for doing that.

Slide Twenty-two:

Under Goal 2, the purpose of Goal 2 is development and innovation. The goal here is to support the development of new interventions. You should take that word "intervention" and think about it as broadly as you can. It could include things like instructional practices—what teachers do in front of their classrooms—all the way up to curricula. And it can be curricula that are, say, small in scope—maybe a couple of units of a curriculum—or it could be a full-year curriculum. There's really a wide range depending upon the kinds of work that you are interested and ready to propose.

The interventions could also be materials for teacher professional development or the actual teacher professional development scope and sequence developed.

You should also propose in the context of a Goal 2 application to describe how you are going to demonstrate the feasibility of the intervention for implementation in an authentic education delivery setting.

You may develop an intervention that you can deliver to a group of laboratory school children, but you need to document that this intervention could actually be delivered by typical teachers working with typical students in a typical school context. That's one of the big research components of a development application.

You are also required to collect pilot data on the promise of the intervention to achieve its intended outcomes. This would be work that you would carry out toward the end of a development project.

Slide Twenty-three:

Under Goal 2, the typical range of awards are from $150,000 to $500,000 per year, total cost, direct plus indirect, and you can request up to 3 years' worth of funding.

Slide Twenty-four:

Under Goal 3, you would propose to test efficacy of fully developed interventions. From the Institute's perspective, efficacy is defined as the degree to which an intervention has a net positive impact on the outcomes of interest relative to the program or practice to which it is being compared.

Many of the studies that we fund under the efficacy goal are experimental in nature, and have a treatment group and a control group. And they're trying to determine whether the treatment group, in fact, improves student outcomes over and above what the control group has received.

Slide Twenty-five:

Under efficacy and replication, you can request up to four years' worth of funding, and you can request between $250,000 to $750,000 per year, total cost. There should be an extra zero there. I think I corrected this slide 25 times, and yet every time it shows up on that slide.

I have a question here which says: ***"Are projects partially funded, or does IES only fund completely?"***

I'm not entirely sure what you mean by that question. I'm going to answer it in two ways, and if I don't answer it correctly, please send the question again.

When applications are reviewed, the full application is reviewed, as are the full budgets for the full scope of the project. If you are proposing a 3-year project, the budget and the project will be evaluated for each year of work but as a whole.

If you are recommended for funding, the typical process is that you receive funding for the initial year, and then contingent upon the successful progress of the work, you will receive funding for additional years moving forward. That's one answer to the question.

The other question would be, ***"If you have 3 years' worth of funding and reviewers are really excited about 2 years of the funding, but they don't think the work proposed in year 3 is valuable, would we consider funding only the parts that the reviewers like?***

The answer to that question is that the reviewers actually have some discretion during panel discussions, and they have the discretion to recommend funding, say, only years 1 and 2 of a project or studies one and two of a project and not recommending funding of year 3.

I must tell you that doesn't happen all that often. Typically, the work proposed in a project is highly integrated, and it sometimes becomes difficult to think about how to pull that apart. I hope that addressed your question.

Slide Twenty-six:

Under Goal 4, scale-up evaluations, again, I told you these are the biggest projects we fund under our typical standing programs. Here, the goal really is to test the impact of interventions when implemented at scale. The idea here is what do we--to gather information about whether interventions when implemented by regular teachers in regular classrooms, with no more professional development or support provided than what would typically be provided, do we still see the same kinds of positive effects on student outcomes that we had seen in smaller efficacy trials?

It states here that studies using randomized assignment to treatment and comparison conditions are strongly preferred, and that is, in fact, the language in the RFA.

Slide Twenty-seven:

Again, a typical range for scale-up evaluations is $500,000 to $1.2 million per year. Again, that is total cost, direct plus indirect, and you may request up to 5 years' worth of funding.

Slide Twenty-eight:

Under our measurement goal, the focus here is to develop and test assessments or other measurement tools. I have sort of less information here in part because there are a range of different possible types of projects that can be considered under here, and I want to encourage you all, if there are folks interested in the measurement goal, to contact program officers directly to talk about your particular project.

Typical range is $150,000 to $400,000 per year, and you may request up to 4 years' worth of funding for these projects.

Slide Twenty-nine:

The first decision you have to make is which goal and topic are right for you. I am going to encourage all of you on the phone to step back and think about what are the topics and goals where you will be able to best demonstrate and utilize your own expertise and skills.

Remember that part of the reviewer's challenge is to evaluate the degree to which the personnel on a project and the resources available to a project will allow the whole project to actually take place. What you describe in your Project Narrative—there needs to be a match between what you propose to do and the people and resources that you have in place on the project. You need to think long and hard about what are your skills and expertise, what do you have, and what—and how can you demonstrate the skills and expertise to reviewers who may or may not know your work. You want to think about that.

At the outset of a project, you want to start to think about which goal is appropriate for the questions you want to answer. Typically, researchers come to us and say, we want to do all three. We want to do some exploration work, we want to develop

that intervention, and we want to test the efficacy of it. We want to do that in 3 years. And my response to most applicants is that 3 years is probably an insufficient amount of time for what you want to do, for doing all three of those. The Institute has made a decision that applicants need to make a selection about which goal they're ready to start with.

You don't have to start at Goal 1, right? If you already did a Goal 1 exploratory study for your dissertation, say, you've published on that, you're ready to move into the intervention phase, that is completely fine. You just need to let the reviewers know what it is that you've already done that supports your ability to move to the next question.

Again, I want to recommend that you look at the abstracts of projects funded under a research topic. We do have a large number of them up. I will tell you that some of the most recent ones don't have abstracts up. We are working on getting those prepared, and they will be posted over time. If they're not there, just be patient, or you can certainly reach out to the program officer and ask if they have additional information they can share with you.

The link there at the bottom of the page will take you to our grant search tool where you can actually search by topic, by goal, by year, by principal investigator, whatever makes sense for you.

Slide Thirty:

As I said before, people often ask me, well, what if my program of research is between goals or topics. And the answer is, you must pick one, okay, and you have to—and it's often hard. But I think that if you read the RFA, if you think about how you break the project down into smaller pieces, talk to the program staff, we can help you think through where you are.

Don't put in a project that allows you to go for the biggest amount of money if you're not ready to do that. Okay? Reviewers will look at that, and they will not be sympathetic, typically.

Your goal is really to create an application that proposes a well-crafted project, that will deliver what it promises, and reviewers will talk about that. Is it too ambitious? Is there demonstration on the personnel that they can actually complete this project? You need to take that into consideration as you're building your application.

Slide Thirty-one:

Again, as I'm saying the same thing here, your challenge is to convince the reviewers that you and your team have the skills and experience to implement well what you have proposed. This is true for all applicants, whether they are young investigators or senior investigators. But I think it is more imperative for young investigators to convince the reviewers that you are the right person to do this work.

Slide Thirty-two:

Young investigators often want to know, how do I build a good team? It's not

necessarily something that you might have a lot of experience with if you are just coming out of graduate school or even if you're a postdoc. You may have been part of a team, but this may be the first time that you've had to think about how you put a good team together.

Slide Thirty-three:

What are the things to consider? Think about the type of expertise that is needed to carry out the project. You will notice in our RFAs, there is a section called Personnel under each of our goals and within each of our topics, and if you look there, we have tried to pull out the kinds of expertise that we think is critical for each of these types of projects. You have to make the decision about whether the expertise is reflected in a single person, in multiple people; and then, again, you need to explain to the reviewers in your application how it is that that expertise is present in your team.

For a development project, you want to make sure you've got someone on that team who has expertise in developing curricula. That might be a teacher. It might be someone who used to work for a publishing company. It might be you, but you need to make sure that that person is identified.

If you are putting together a measurement proposal, you need someone with psychometric expertise on your project, and you need to, again, articulate, explain to the reviewers who that individual is and the type of expertise they bring. In that Personnel section in your Research Narrative, you need to have that.

In almost every project—I am just pausing here for a minute—I think across all of the projects, you need someone with expertise in statistics or methodology, and it needs to be someone with expertise in the statistics or methodologies that you are proposing to use right? Make sure that that there is a match there.

You need to consider the goal you are applying for; and, again, you need to think about what your own training and experience brings to the project. Where are the areas where you are strong, and where are the areas that you could use some additional help?

Slide Thirty-four:

Again, you want to demonstrate your productivity, so that if you're coming in as the principal investigator, it's clear to the reviewers that you are a good pick for that role.

It's often helpful to include a senior researcher with a strong grant record on your project. Sometimes that can happen where the senior researcher could be a coprincipal investigator. It could be that you have a team of senior investigators who will serve in an advisory capacity that will meet at regular intervals to provide you good feedback. There are multiple ways that you can do that.

However, if you are going to include senior researchers, you do need to make sure that everyone, including those senior researchers, commits enough time so that you can actually implement competently the work you have proposed to do.

Slide Thirty-five:

Now that you've gone through all these steps—you've read the RFA; maybe you've had an initial conversation with the program officer; you have identified a topic and a goal. Go back and re-read the RFA one more time and make sure that your idea fits as well as you think it does within the topic and the goal.

And then maybe send a one-page description of your project to the program officer and set up a time to talk.

Slide Thirty-six:

We can provide you with lots of feedback when you're preparing your application. Unlike, say, a National Science Foundation, IES program staff is not involved in the review process.

Program officers are responsible for providing technical support to applicants and then providing technical support to grantees once they are awarded a grant.

We have a separate office that handles our review process, and because of that, program officers are here to provide feedback on applications. We can talk with you about your idea, about your topic, and we can provide reviews and comments of draft proposals.

Now, you must recognize that the comments that we provide reflect our own expertise and are only our personal opinions. Our comments are not taken into account in a review process, and we can't always identify the concerns that individual reviewers will raise during the formal review. But it's great to have an outside eye and to have someone who is familiar with our process to help you identify certain gaps or places where your applications can become stronger.

Slide Thirty-seven:

In order to prepare the grant application itself—you have an idea; you started to flesh out your ideas. You want to make sure that you have all three of these documents. You want to have the appropriate Request for Applications, whether it is the Education RFA, or the Special Education RFA, or whether it's one of the other topic areas that I laid out.

You want to make sure that you have the IES Grants.gov Application Submission Guide. This will provide you with detailed guidance in terms of filling out the forms that are on Grants.gov—things like the cover sheet or the budget and other pieces, other formatting requirements of the application itself.

And you will also want to make sure you have downloaded the full Application Package from Grants.gov, so that you can start to complete the content, the boxes, if you will, on each of these forms.

Slide Thirty-eight:

I hope people are chuckling here. You have to write a good application to get funded, and you must make sure you complete everything. Okay? You've got to complete all the components of the narrative, and you must make sure that you have all of the required components of the full Application Package. If you do not, your application will be returned to you without review, and there will not be another opportunity for you to submit an application until June 2010. Make sure that you pay attention to those details and that you've included information in each of the places where it needs to be included.

Slide Thirty-nine:

What does the Application Package include? The Application Package includes the Standard Form 424 Research and Related forms, which includes the Research and Related Total Federal and Non-Federal Budget form. This is the form that says who the principal investigator is, what's your address, what topic and goal are you applying to, who is the Sponsored Projects Officer at the institution you are applying from. I'm trying to think what other information there is in it.

The budget, of course, includes all the budget information. That's the spreadsheet for each of the years of funding that you're requesting.

We do not require individuals to have matching nonfederal funds. However, if there are nonfederal funds that will be contributing to this project, you are asked to include that in your 424 form.

Your application will also include a one-page project summary or abstract which describes the work that you're proposing to complete. It will describe the content; it will include the contents of the application.

Slide Forty:

And here the next slide will tell us what those contents are. The contents of the application—and details about this are described in the Request for Applications. The body of the application is the Project Narrative. That's the content. That's the part that the reviewers spend the most time with. For our research grant competitions, that narrative is 25 pages—single-spaced—in length, using 12-point font.

Some of the other grant programs, the page lengths are different. If you're looking at applying under a different grant competition, please make sure you find out how many pages are expected.

You should include a bibliography and references cited. There's no page limit for that. You can include as many pages as you need to be comprehensive.

You should include biographical sketches of the key project personnel. These biographical sketches can only be four pages in length. You and your colleagues will need to spend some time identifying what are the critical components of your professional history that need to be on these biographical sketches in order to make it clear that the

team members have the relevant expertise for this particular project. This becomes particularly important for senior researchers, many of whom have CVs that are 50 pages in length. You need to tell the individuals who are on your teams to think about their biographical sketches early and to provide you with that four-page version of it.

You are also expected to include a narrative budget justification, which explains why you are requesting the budget that you are requesting and how the funds are going to be expended.

If you are planning to have subawards with other institutions, you are also expected to include a budget spreadsheet for them as well as budget justifications for those subawards.

Slide Forty-one:

The application contents also include appendix A. Appendix A is 15 pages in length. It must include Letters of Agreement from participating schools or districts, or if you're putting in a Goal 1 study and you are going to be working with a longitudinal data set, you will need to document that you have access to that data set.

For a junior investigator, you may also want to include a Letter of Agreement from your dean that, say, if you're requesting a course buy-out, that that is something that the dean would support.

You can also include in appendix A any tables or figures that support the Research Narrative. If you wanted to include, say, preliminary findings from dissertation work or earlier work and you don't want to put the table, the full table, in the text because you don't want to lose a page—it's a 25-page narrative—you can refer to it and put it in the appendix.

For, say, a Goal 2, if you are proposing, you will need to propose a theory of change, and say you want to have a logic model, you can include that in appendix A, as well—a figure that describes sort of your theoretical model, your theoretical model of change, that you're using to describe why the intervention components that you're developing should change student outcomes in a particular way.

Let's think. Another figure that is often helpful in appendix A might be a timeline for your project. It can help the reviewers think through the likelihood of a project being completed if they have a good sense of what things are going to be tackled during year 1, year 2, and year 3.

In appendix B—now, this is an optional appendix. You are not required to include this appendix. However, you have an additional 10 pages. If you have sample curriculum materials, scope, and sequence—if you have some sample observational instruments, whatever—it's really a place where you can put example materials. Go in appendix B.

Please do read both the Request for Applications and the Grants.gov Submission

Guide. That will help you identify whether the content you are proposing to put in appendix A or B is permissible.

If the Standards and Review staff determine that the content you've put in appendix A or B is material that truly belonged in the Research Narrative and was not part of the exceptions that can go in the appendices, they will remove that material from the appendix. So please make sure that what you put in there meets the requirements of the RFA.

If you are recommended for funding, there are additional forms that you will need to complete that are available on Grants.gov, but they don't need to be completed right now.

Slide Forty-two:

Another question a young investigator may ask is, how on earth do I put a budget together? I think that my best recommendation is you want to talk with your Sponsored Projects Office, your Office of Grants and Contracts; if you are at a nonprofit or a for-profit company, your budget office.

You want to talk with someone who has expertise in developing budgets. They can help you, say, figure out what the appropriate fringe benefits are. They can also help you think about what are expenses that you could include to help make sure that your project runs smoothly that you may never have thought about before.

We have typical categories. There's personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, any contractual or subaward costs, the indirect cost rate, and then we have the wonderful category of "other". And under "other," you put basically anything else.

If you have a question about whether what you are proposing is an allowable cost, you can talk to one of us. You can look at the OMB circular. There is an OMB Circular A-121, which is for institutions of higher education that are coming in. I know there is one for nonprofits as well. Use those as guidance. That's what we use to determine whether something is allowable or not.

Slide Forty-three:

Putting the narrative together.

Slide Forty-four:

You want to make sure you have four sections here.

Each Research Narrative—or Project Narrative—has four sections. Each of these sections are evaluated by the reviewers. You want to make sure that you have these four sections, that they're clearly marked in the application, in the application itself, so the reviewers don't have to hunt for that information. You should have a section addressing Significance, a section addressing the Research Plan, a section addressing the Personnel, and a section addressing Resources.

Slide Forty-five:

The Significance section—and you guys are going to find that I'm going to tell you to go back and read the RFA. There are different expectations for what goes in the Significance section as a function of the research goal that you are applying to. Goal 1, Goal 2, they have different kinds of information in the Significance. However, across all of them, there is a call for a description of the theoretical foundation and the prior empirical support for your proposed work.

One of the things you need to think about is how much of your space you should devote to the Significance section. I think, particularly for young investigators, there is a tendency to write longer Significance sections than perhaps is warranted. It is really important that you put out your theoretical foundation and your prior empirical support. But please know that you need to reserve sufficient space in your narrative so that you can describe in detail what you are proposing to do. Because the reviewers really want to know what the money is being spent for, and that should be in the methodological section. This is one sort of piece of advice to take into account.

Slide Forty-six:

The Research Plan is typically the longest section of any application. Again, the content of it is going to depend upon, of course, the Request for Applications that you're applying to and the research goal. A development goal has a different set of methodological expectations from an efficacy study, and all of that is laid out quite explicitly in the Request for Applications.

If you go to the goal section of the RFA, which is through the second half of the Request for Applications, you'll notice that within each goal, we have a section labeled "Significance," a section labeled "Research Plan," a section labeled "Personnel," and a section labeled "Resources." Use the information in that section of the RFA to structure your writing of your Research Narrative.

Another important piece of advice here is to know that the details are key and to make sure that what you are planning to do—the research activities you are planning to carry out, how you plan to carry it out, who is going to do the data collection, how you plan to analyze the data—make sure that all of that is clearly described.

Reviewers will want to know if you're doing an efficacy study, if you've included a power analysis. They will look at the power analysis. They will ask whether, in fact, the power analysis was accurately completed and whether it actually is appropriate given the kind of work you are proposing to do. And reviewers will evaluate your application as a function of those details that you include.

Slide Forty-seven:

The Personnel section is particularly important for junior investigators. I think it's a real opportunity for you to provide a compelling argument as to why you and your team are the appropriate team to carry out the work you've proposed. In the Personnel section,

make sure you include a short paragraph for each of the individuals that clearly describes what their role and percentage of effort will be on the proposed project and how their prior experience supports their role and percentage of effort.

You want to use those biographical sketches, the short CVs, to further document expertise and productivity.

The budget narrative—just something to remember if you are starting to think, oh, my goodness, how am I going to get all this information in, given the page constraints. The budget narrative is an unlimited page number, and it is also a place where you can include additional information about, say, research assistants and other personnel who are important to the project but whose role may not sort of be appropriately described in the key personnel or in a biographical sketch.

Okay. I have a question about indirect cost. I'm going to get to that in just a second.

Slide Forty-eight:

In Resources, the Resources section, this is the fourth section. You want to make sure you include a section called "Resources." Your university, again, or your organization probably has some material they've already prepared that you used to support, to go into a Resources section. But the resources you want to describe are going to depend upon the project you are proposing. Again, the data set you're proposing to analyze, if you're going to do a secondary data set—secondary analysis of a data set for a Goal 1 study—that's the resource. You can describe the data set there.

Teachers, classrooms, and schools who you are planning to work with and collaborate with during your research—those are also resources, and you want to make sure it's clear where you're planning to carry out your work.

Perhaps you need a computer laboratory, whether it's at your institution or whether at the school. How are you going to document that you have availability of appropriate computer resources? You want to make sure you include a description of the relevant information in the section.

Again, don't forget to include in appendix A access to schools or data sets that you need to have access to in order to conduct your research project.

Slide Forty-nine:

Okay. I'm going to pause here and answer this question which says: ***"In reading the packet, it appears that there is a limit on the indirect costs. What is the indirect rate limit, and where is it found?"***

There is actually not an indirect cost limit for any of our programs, except for the training program, which is not currently being competed. I'm not quite sure where this is

coming from.

We do have language in the Request for Applications, which says that if you are proposing to carry out the majority of your work off campus, then you can request the off-campus indirect rate. However, individual institutions have different indirect cost agreements that they've negotiated with the federal government, and it is the institution's negotiated rate that you will use in your application. IES doesn't have any limits on the rates you can request.

I have a question here about Goal 2, which says: ***"In a Goal 2 during the last pilot year, is the power analysis recommended?"***

It is not. In Goal 2, that pilot data, the preliminary data, is really just meant to be a preliminary indication that the intervention that you have developed is moving students in the direction that you intended for it to go. It is not meant to be any sort of an efficacy trial. I would not encourage you to include a power analysis in the current Goal 2 requirements. All right? A critical resource is the relationship with schools.

Again, one of the hard things about doing a webinar is that I don't have a lot of information about my audience. I don't know what your backgrounds or expertise are, whether you're familiar with the process or not. But if you are considering putting in an application for October 1, and you have not already started to build relationships with the schools that you are intending to work with, you need to start that immediately.

Reviewers do look to see if Letters of Agreement are included from the schools or districts that you have identified that you plan to work with, and if you do not have that in your application, then the score for your Resources section will be negatively affected.

And the other thing, too, is, again, if this is not something you do frequently, you will know or you will learn that it is not always easy to get Letters of Agreement from schools. And particularly now that schools are starting up, this is a real busy time for schools, so just as a word of caution.

Oh, all right. I have another question that I will answer in a minute. I am going to finish these slides, and then I will come back to that.

Slide Fifty:

Some additional reminders. Do pay attention to what can and cannot be included in the appendices. I do want to let you know that applications, when they come in, are screened for compliance, and if there is information included in the appendix that is not permitted, it will be removed.

I want to encourage everyone to prepare your application far enough in advance so that you can get feedback not only from IES, but also from colleagues at your institutions who aren't involved in the project. It is really helpful to have other colleagues read your application and let you know where there is a lack of clarity in what you've written, or

where you've talked about something in your theory of change and it's not evident in your Research Plan—just to pick up some of those, perhaps, incoherences.

Slide Fifty-one:

From the reviewer's perspective, you want to write as clearly and concisely as you can. When you put all of this information together, these applications are often 100 pages long. Each reviewer typically reviews between 10 and 15 applications. You guys can do the math and figure out how much paper and content the individual reviewers have to process. You want to do everything you can in putting an application together to make it easy for the reviewer to understand what you're proposing to do, and you don't want them to make incorrect inferences about what you're proposing to do. Be as clear as you can in putting the application together and be concise.

You want to make sure you address all of the points that are described in the RFA and that are required for the particular goal that you're applying to.

You want to organize the information in a logical sequence. Again, there is a sequence that's laid out in the Request for Applications. That sequence may or may not make sense given the work that you're proposing. Whatever you do, try to make sure that the sequence is logical.

Please label your sections and number your pages. I think if you write "Significance" in a bold header and then the next section is Research Plan, you might even consider using the subheaders that we have included in RFA, and please include page numbers so that when reviewers are having a conversation around the table that they can, in fact, easily refer to, on page X, that's where that information is. Okay? The bottom line is make it as easy as you can for the reviewers to find and understand the information that you're presenting.

Slide Fifty-two:

Submitting an application.

I'm going to pause here and answer this question**: *"Since you have emphasized the importance of clarifying one of the five goals, and that will drive content of the narrative, how does this apply to the Chronically Low-Performing Schools Initiative?"***

It doesn't. The Chronically Low-Performing Schools Initiative has a different set of requirements, and you need to pull the Requests for Applications for that initiative; and within that initiative, there is a description of what is required.

Within those applications, there will be a section on Significance, a section on the Research Plan, Personnel section, and a Resources section. However, the content of the Research Plan is different from the goal structure that we have identified here. So you need to go back to that initiative, to that RFA, and read it carefully.

I believe there was a webinar that was held directing chronically low-performing

schools, and those slides should be posted on our website, as well as a transcript. You should look for it there.

And, actually, my next question was: ***"Will this PowerPoint be available for review after the webinar? How can we get a copy?"***

This will be posted on our website at the webinar link, which is the link you should have gotten to in order to register. Transcripts will come up, although they will take a little bit of time to get prepared, and we may, in fact, have audio. I know we're still discussing whether we will have that available or not. Okay?

Submitting the application. All applications must be submitted electronically. They must be submitted through the Grants.gov portal.

A word of caution, a word to the wise: Sending an e-mail to us with the application attached does not count as submitting your application. It must go through the Grants.gov portal. You need to make sure that your institution is registered, and that you know what you need to do from your institution's point of view in order to get your application submitted on time and in a fashion where it's complete.

Our next deadline is October 1, 2009. Those applications must be uploaded and received by 4:30 p.m. and zero seconds, Washington, D.C. time. Okay? I include the zero seconds in there because if it is even 1 or 2 seconds late, Grants.gov will flag that application as late, and it will not be sent forward to review.

You need to start early. Don't try to upload it on October 1. I would recommend you upload it a couple of days before. You want to make sure that you have time to go through all the processes. If there's any kind of a glitch on your end, that you have time to correct that, and then to make sure that everything has gone through. Please don't wait until the last minute. All right. There's nothing worse than working so hard on an application and then not being able to submit it in time.

Slide Fifty-three:

Okay. As you're getting ready to push that final Submit button, how do you know that it's done? All the online forms are complete. The PDFs of the application contents have been uploaded. The authorized representative has completed the final step of the electronic process. It is the authorized representative who pushes that Submit button, not the principal investigator. And you have received an e-mail acknowledging receipt of your application. You need to make sure that all of those steps are completed in order for your application to be submitted.

Slide Fifty-four:

Final reminders here.

Slide Fifty-five:

Start early. Again, I don't know where everyone is at on the phones. If you had just found out about this program and you are thinking about putting an application together, I think it may be tough to get something together for October 1. But this gives you a great head start to think about preparing an application for our June deadline for next year, which we anticipate will be happening, and you can prepare a very strong application for then.

Make sure you have read carefully the appropriate Request for Applications. If, for whatever reason, you have trouble identifying or locating those RFAs, please just let me know. I can send you a direct link to them.

Talk with the IES program officer, whoever is the relevant program officer for the program you are applying to. We can provide you with as much or as little help as you want, but we're really here to help you put together as good an application as you can.

And, finally, start the online submission process early as well.

Slide Fifty-six:

Okay. Here are the things to remember, particularly for young investigators who are new to this whole process. You can't get funded if you don't submit an application. People will often—young folks say to me, "But am I even going to have a chance? I mean, I'm going to be competing with all these other senior investigators who have so much more experience than I do." Well, that's true, but you certainly can't get funded if you don't ever put an application in. The first step is to put an application in.

Revise and resubmit is the rule for all applicants, not the exception. It is rare to get funded on your first time you put an application in. You get feedback from two, three, four reviewers, depending upon what competition you submit to, and you can use that information to improve your application and reapply.

And persistence often pays off. Okay. We can't, of course, guarantee that projects are going to get funded. There's no way we could do that, because it depends upon the reviewers. But I will say that putting in applications a second or a third time often does end up in a funded application, and often ends up in an improved funded application. Grantees that I work with often say, "Wow, I'm really glad I went through that review process because what we're doing now is so much better than what we originally proposed."

Slide Fifty-seven:

Here is our web address and my contact information. Please don't hesitate if you have a question that I didn't answer today or a question you'd rather talk to someone one-on-one with. Send me an e-mail. If I'm not the appropriate person, I will forward your e-mail to the appropriate individuals, and we'll try to get back to you as soon as we can. It's getting to be a little bit busy now, but we will certainly respond as quickly as we can.

I'm going to pause for a second. We have a minute or two left. If there is anyone else, if there are any other questions from folks, please do send them. I'll wait a little bit here. Again, I hope this has been helpful. I know it's hard to do this without faces on the other end, but thanks for your attention. And I'm just going to stop and do my instructional wait time here and see if I get any questions.

Great. I don't see any fast fingers typing, what I can see on my end. Again, again, thank you so much for your attention, and please don't hesitate to send me an e-mail, and I will do my best to answer your questions. Have a great afternoon.