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Preparing to Write: The ABCs and the CCCs

- **Always Be Creating/Creative**
  - Ideas
  - Problems
  - Partnerships
- Bring ‘Idea Book’ wherever you go
- Talk out your ideas regularly (e.g., family, friends, mentors, students, staff)
- **Connect with Creative Community**
  - Be intentional
  - Be selective
  - Be consistent
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## Write to Win...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When You’re Writing</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If Writing were Media...</td>
<td>Lord of the Rings</td>
<td>Shark Tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>Experts + NonExperts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting to the “YES!”</td>
<td>Good Quality (meets standard)</td>
<td>Best Quality (top X%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Tense</td>
<td>Past (What’s been done)</td>
<td>Future (Imagine what we could do)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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New faculty perspective

Reviewer for:
- NSF OAC (panel)
- NSF DMR (ad hoc)
- DOE (ad hoc)
- XSEDE (panel)
- ORNL (ad hoc)
- NSF GRFP (panel)

Active grants:
- NSF CAREER DMR # 1944974 (PI)
- NSF OAC #1931367 (PI)
- Oak Ridge Nat Lab CNMS grant (PI)
- NSF XSEDE (Co-PI): comp. time
- DOE INCITE (Co-PI): comp. time

Email: hanna.terletska@mtsu.edu
“…we are all teaching, have other responsibilities…. How do I find time to spend (‘waste’?) on a proposal writing…”

“… certain departments lack graduate programs and have heavier teaching loads…. How do I do grant writing under such circumstances?”

“….. since MTSU is not considered by the NSF to be a Primarily Undergraduate Institution, the traditional undergraduate-themed funding paths are closed to those doing basic science. How can I even compete then (with R1 universities)?”

Mentoring is truly critical for the faculty success. 
Successful faculty = successful university. Today’s focus: learning from your MTSU peers.
Grant writing is a learning skill and a full-time job (acceptance rate ~20%).

Only you can teach yourself how to write a winning proposal by doing it.

My teaching load for the last 3 years: 3 classes/semester. New department curriculum launch.

**Year 1: 2017-2018**

1. FRCAC (No).
2. KITP Scholar Award (Yes) - Fall break.
3. ORNL-collaboration (Yes) - Fall break.
4. Powe grant (No) - Christmas break.
5. FRCAC-Spring (Yes).
6. NSF-collaborative (No) - Spring break.
7. NSF XSEDE (collaborative, Yes) - Summer.

Summer-used FRCAC grant to travel to ORNL; talks + new collaborations.

**Year 2: 2018-2019**

1. FRCAC (No).
2. ORNL-collaboration (Yes) - Fall break.
3. Powe grant - last try (No) - Christmas break.
4. NSF-collaborative 2nd try (Yes) - Spring break.
5. NSF CAREER (Yes) - Spring/Summer.

Summer: grant writing; research; talks; travels; student workshop.

_Became a reviewer!_

- Be strategic and intentional.
- Prioritize.
- Be proactive to make time, schedule blocks of writing sessions.
- Learn from others: talk to your colleagues, Dept. Chair, visit NSF workshops, etc.
Grant application: “writing” proposal is not just about writing

- Think of that great idea; Communicate to others why it is so great: how others will benefit from it.

- **Find the right program to sell the idea to.** Read solicitation, Dear Colleague letter, RFA, the description and directions carefully. Identify the key words to anchor to make your proposal program-relevant. **Contact the Program Officer.**

- Demonstrate that you are the right person to do it: establish your research group here at MTSU, publish papers, give talks, train students.

- Obtain the preliminary data: reviewers will know the difference between a grounded hypothesis and a wishful thinking.

- Establish collaborations.

- Make yourself recognizable in the field, meet your potential reviewers at conference; publish papers, give invited talks.

- Writing: **Examples:** studying successful proposals, might be helpful for New PI to see the best practices for structuring of the proposal.

- **Writing:** Write proposal.

- Writing: **Editing proposal:** have other to read your proposal (ask for the red-line team to rip it off).
Write stuff:

• You are selling your product “your great idea” to the reviewers and the NSF program.

• Tell them: what you want to do and why (outcome)? Why you are the right person to do it?

• Convince them that it is right, safe and timely to invest in you and your idea.
Write stuff: Good idea is not enough; you need to sell it.

WRITING FOR REVIEWERS

1. Reviews do not read your application because they want to; they read it because they have to.

2. Understand the review process. Who and based on what criteria will review your proposal (experts, non-experts, ad-hoc reviews, panel).

3. Don’t make reviews think hard, work hard; make it easy for them. Give reviewers exactly they need to fully and fairly review your proposal.

4. First 2 pages are critical to maximize the reviewers’ friendliness. You need to “hook” their interest, so they would want to read the details.

5. The reviews will see if this is the last-minute proposal, or that you have actually put efforts into it.

Become a reviewer yourself!

I have been a reviewer for:
- NSF OAC (panel)
- NSF DMR (ad hoc)
- DOE (ad hoc)
- XSEDE (panel)
- ORNL (ad hoc)
- NSF GRFP (panel)

Good communication and presentation is the key.
Merit review criteria: know how your application will be evaluated

- **Intellectual Merit**: the potential to **advance knowledge**

- **Broader Impacts**: the potential to **benefit society**

  The reviewers need to find the information in your proposal to answer the following questions:

1. What is the potential for the proposed activity to:
   a. **Advance knowledge and understanding** within its own field or across different fields
   b. **Benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes**.

2. To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore **creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts**?

3. Is the **plan** for carrying out the proposed activities **well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale**? Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to **assess success**?

4. How well **qualified is the individual, team, or organization** to conduct the proposed activities.

5. Are there **adequate resources available** to the PI (either at the home organization or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities?
Good presentation

- Use the first 2 pages to show that you understand the sponsor’s objectives, establish your objectives, and frame a compelling argument.

- Be clear and write in simple-declarative sentences. Every paragraph must flow logically.

- Be specific: heavy (generic) worded sentences often send empty messages, which reviewers notice (“my research will advance the field of physics significantly”).

- Avoid weak words, e.g., hope, try, believe, etc.

- Formatting and well structure are very important. use headings, subheading; bold text (be careful)...

- Take time to make a good quality figures.

Serve on a review panel on do an ad-hoc review to learn how to write for reviewers. Evaluate what you write as though you are a reviewer.

First two pages … a roadmap for the remaining pages.

OVERVIEW & OBJECTIVES

Hurricanes-related losses in the United States are skyrocketing due to poorly engineered buildings. Available data confirm that losses have gone from $1.3 Trillion in 1990 to $58 Billion post-2005 (Allsen, 2010). Failure of low-rise structures, which are the most common building type and are also most vulnerable to hurricane-inflicted damage, is a major contributor to such cost escalation (Goosbroed, 2012). Damage is primarily attributable to roof failure and water intrusion. Over the past decades, small-scale wind tunnel modeling has provided useful information for the design of buildings. However, we now know that approach often underestimates peak negative pressure (vacuum) at vulnerable locations of the envelope (roof and wall cladding) of low-rise structures. Therefore, there is an urgent need to develop a strategy that is capable of achieving a small-scale modeling of building envelopes that is a roadmap for the remaining pages.

Source: NSF Grant's application workbook
Last, but not least

• Writing is hard, devoting plenty of time to the task is a must. Some recommends setting aside a week for each page of a proposal. It can take months to get a proposal together.

• Scheduling should include time for rewrites, proofreads and secondary reads by friends, colleagues and family members.

• Working right up to the deadline can undo weeks to months of hard work.
Rejection is the part of the game. How to deal with it?

**NSF does aim for inclusion and diversity among funded universities and scholars.**

- **It is hard:** a lot of New faculty often find those rejections really tough to take and personal. It is OK to be sad, angry, cry, grieve…. But don’t let it set you back! Try! Fail! Try again!

- **Share your rejection** with a friend, Dept Chair, Dean, Program Directors at MTSU, colleagues. They might not just provide a support but also give you a useful feedbacks and words of encouragement.

- Being a renowned scientist doesn’t ensure success. Carol Greider (molecular biologist won a Nobel prize in 2009) - same day, a Nobel prize and a grant rejection. “On the same day you win the Nobel prize, skeptics may still question whether you really know what you are doing”.

- Negative feedback might be a good learning experience; one can learn much from the rejected grants.

- **Seek the feedback:** contact the program director (AFTER you calm down. *Never* call when you are angry or upset.)

Great article on how to deal with grant rejection: https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-004550#:~:text=Put%20the%20application%20to%20one.grant%20when%20you%20are%20ready.
Thank you for your interest and participation!

Good luck, hard work will pay off eventually.

We want to hear from you. Send us your feedback.
Email me if you want to chat more
hanna.terletska@mtsu.edu