

ARHU Faculty Fellowships Workshop

July 24, 2014

Overview

- Fellowship Narrative Writing Strategies
- 4 common fellowship opportunities
 - Guggenheim
 - ACLS
 - NEH 6 mo/12 mo Fellowship
 - NEH Summer Stipend
- Review and Discussion of NEH criteria
- Discussion of proposal ideas/project plans

Before Writing:

PLAN

- Project Scope/Plan
- Writing Schedule – build in time for:
 - Securing letters of recommendation
 - Getting outsiders to your field to read and comment
 - Ensuring you have included all proposal components
- Routing and Submission

READ SUCCESSFUL PROPOSALS

Narrative Writing: Language

- Audience
- Key Words
- Clear, Concise, Compelling

“Whatever the project may mean to the author of the proposal, ***it is for the reviewers inseparable from the language in which it is presented.***” (Gillis, 2008)

Language

Academic Writing

Researcher Centered:
Scholarly Passion

Past Oriented:
Work you have done

Expository:
Explaining to Reader

Impersonal:
Objective, dispassionate

Individualistic:
Often solo activities

Verbosity rewarded:
Fewer length constraints

Specialized Terminology:
“Insider Jargon”

Proposal Writing

Sponsor-Centered:
Service attitude

Future oriented:
Work you wish to do

Persuasive:
“Sell” the reader

Personal:
Convey excitement

Team-oriented:
Feedback needed

Brevity rewarded:
Strict length constraints

Accessible language:
Broad audience

Impersonal vs. personal

- Cautious, objective, dispassionate, focused on topic, writer's persona hidden from view
- Convey excitement, use active voice, strong energetic phrasing and direct references to themselves

Specialized terminology vs. Accessible language

The objective of this study is to develop an effective commercialization strategy for solar energy systems by analyzing the factors that are impeding commercial projects and by prioritizing the potential government and industry actions that can facilitate the viability of the projects.

This study will consider why current solar energy systems have not yet reached the commercial stage and will evaluate the steps that industry and government can take to make these systems commercial.

ARHU SUCCESS

Guggenheim - Dean's office records		
2014	Holly Brewer	History
2013	Joshua Weiner	English
2012	Robert Levine	English
2011	Heather Nathans	TDPS
2011	Matthew Kirschenbaum	English
2009	Juan Carlos Quintero-Herencia	SLLC
2009	Vincent Carretta	English
2009	José Quiroga	SLLC
2008	Mary Kay Vaughan	History
2005	Sally Promey	ARTH
2003	Merle Collins	English
2003	Ira Berlin	History
2001	Donald Sutherland	History
NEH 6/12 mo. - NEH records 2000-2014		
2014	Barbara Haagh-Huglo	MUSC
2013	Vessela Valiavitcharska	ENGL
2012	Robert Levine	ENGL
2010	Jason Rudy	ENGL
2010	Edlie Wong	ENGL
2009	Holly Brewer	HIST
2007	Theresa M. Coletti	ENGL
2006	Shirley Logan	ENGL
2005	Matthew Kirschenbaum	ENGL
2005	Carla Peterson	ENGL
2004	Jane L. Donawerth	ENGL
2004	Anthony Colantuono	ARTH
2004	Renee Ater	ARTH
2004	Andrea Frisch	SLLC
2004	Julie Greene	HIST
2004	John Horty	PHIL
2001	Mathias Frisch	PHIL
NEH Summer - NEH records 2000-2014		
2014	Valerie Orlando	French
2013	Richard Bell	HIST
2012	Daryle Williams	HIST
2010	Peter Wien	HIST
2008	Rachel Singpurwalla	PHIL
2008	Holly Brewer	History
2000	William Sherman	ENGL
2000	Jennifer L. DeLapp	MUSC
ACLS - Searched ACLS available records 2006-2014		
2014	Jason Rudy	English

John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation

- “Midcareer” awards –demonstrated exceptional capacity
- Focus on 1 project – propose balanced, focused goal
- Receives 3,500-4,500 applications per year → 200 awards (5%)
- Selection Process:
 - Pooled with others in same field, examined by experts in field
 - Recommendations forwarded to Committee of Selection
 - Committee of Selection determines # of awards in each area
 - Board of Trustees makes final approval
- Reasons for rejections not provided

Guggenheim Application

- Career narrative (not a resume)
- List of work – Publications, Exhibitions, Performances, Compositions, Films or Videotapes
- Statement of Plans for project period
- References (up to 4) – letters will be solicited directly by email
- Examples of work
- Deadline mid-September

American Council of Learned Societies

- 6-12 months of dedicated time, stipend based on academic rank
- Goal: Major piece of scholarly work
- Two-Stage Review Process:
 1. Three established scholars in your discipline review proposal in context of others at your rank in the profession in your discipline
 2. Panel of scholars with expertise covering a range of disciplines review proposal against others at your rank, from various disciplines
- Deadline September 24, 2014

ACLS Application

- Completed application form
- Proposal (no more than five pages, double spaced, in Times New Roman 11-point font)
- Up to two additional pages of images, musical scores, or other similar supporting non-text materials [optional]
- Bibliography (no more than two pages)
- Publications list (no more than two pages)
- Two reference letters

National Endowment for the Humanities

Fellowship

- 6-12 mo stipend \$4,200/mo
- Received avg. 1,252 applications/year. Awards avg 88 per year (7%).
- Deadline ~ May 1, 2015

Summer Stipend

- Stipend \$6,000 for 2 consecutive months
- Received avg. 960 applications/year. Awards avg 80 per year (8%).
- Limited Submission – 2 Campus Nominations
 - LOI due 9/2/14
 - Campus Deadline 9/19/14
 - NEH Deadline 9/30/14

NEH Application

- Narrative – 3 single-spaced pages
 - Research and Contribution
 - Methods and Work Plan
 - Competencies, Skills, and Access
 - Final Product and Dissemination
- Bibliography - 1 single-spaced page
- Resume – 2 single-spaced pages
- Appendix
- Letters of Recommendation (2) – will be solicited directly by email

NEH Review Process/Guidance

Panel Review Process - Panels “built” based upon Fields selected by applicants

- Five Panelists read/comment online, then come to NEH with preliminary ratings for panel discussion



- Panelists provide final ratings after discussion



- NEH Staff Report



- National Council



- NEH Chairman (December 1 decisions for May 1 applications)

NEH Review Criteria

1. The intellectual significance of the proposed project, including its value to humanities scholars, general audiences or both
2. The quality or promise of quality of the applicant's work as an interpreter of the humanities
3. The quality of the conception, definition, organization, and description of the project and the applicant's clarity of expression
4. The feasibility of the proposed plan of work, including, when appropriate the soundness of the dissemination and access plans.
5. The likelihood that the applicant will complete the project

NEH Review Criteria in Action

Discussion of Project Ideas/Plans

Routing - ORA

- PI should notify Contract Administrator as soon as he or she is aware that the proposal is to be submitted
 - Stephanie Swartz , X58280, sswartz1@umd.edu
- Internal Routing Form must be completed
- Submit one hard copy (2 copies if the department will be picking up a signed original from ORA) to ORA for review **at least six business days** prior to the submission deadline

Words of Advice

- You can do everything perfectly and still not get a grant. The numbers will always be against you and quirky things happen with the judging. So go easy on yourself--and try over 2-3 years.
- Propose a *major* project with *major* consequences for scholarship and public knowledge that you can prove you will finish during the year's time, whether it be new research or completing an already started project. Whichever, you must outline precisely what the result will be and how you will achieve it.
- Write the Narrative with a learned, but general and non-specialist audience in mind.
- Follow all instructions perfectly and read the sample proposals that are available.

Resources and Links

- ACLS: <https://www.acls.org/programs/acls/>
- Guggenheim: <http://www.gf.org/about-the-foundation/the-fellowship/>
- NEH Fellowship: <http://www.neh.gov/grants/research/fellowships>
- NEH Summer Stipends: <http://www.neh.gov/grants/research/summer-stipends>

- NEH Sample Proposals available online – searchable database and can request up to two additional

- ARHU colleagues as resources
 - Building a library of successful proposals
 - Words of Advice

- ARHU Dean's office staff available to review and comment on proposal drafts and/or conceptualization
Cara Kennedy
301-405-4698
ckenned3@umd.edu