We want to take this brief opportunity to thank the entire AU grants community and the staffs of OSP & GCA, for their support and patience while we continue to make improvements to both pre and post award administration. At the moment we are engaged in policy development and process streamlining between OSP and GCA operations.

Stay tuned each month for further information, and once again, thanks for your support and patience.

Sincerely,

Jim & Deominic
Uniform Guidance and the Importance of Internal Controls Part 1
By: Joe Gesa, OSP Systems Administrator

The Uniform Guidance Requirements, Cost Principels, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards, located in the Code of Federal Regulations Title 2, Part 200 (2 CFR § 200), is the rule book for providing good stewardship of Federal award dollars. Established by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) pursuant to President Obama’s directives under Executive Order 13520, the Uniform Guidance is meant to:

- Ease administrative burden of Federal awards by eliminating potential duplication of guidance in previous OMB Circulars
- Strengthen oversight of Federal funds to reduce risks of waste, fraud, and abuse
- Provide a government-wide standard for grants management that seeks to enhance program outcomes through performance metrics, and evaluation

To achieve these goals, the Uniform Guidance relies heavily on the concept of “internal control.” Borrowing from the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations’ (COSO) Guidance on Internal Control, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) produced its own standards with the publication of its Green Book for Federal agencies. This is the set of standards that the OMB assumes when referencing internal control in the Uniform Guidance. The Green Book defines Internal Control as “…the plans, methods, policies, and procedures used to fulfill the mission, strategic plan, goals, and objectives of the entity.”

True internal control defies centralized management in favor of knowledgeable and competent personnel at all levels because it is a process affected by the institution’s oversight body, management, and staff who all must provide reasonable assurance (note, not absolute assurance) that organizational goals will be met. These objectives, and the risks associated with them, can be categorized as follows:

- Effectiveness and efficiency of operations
- Reliability of reporting for internal and external use and
- Compliance with applicable laws and regulations

While there are multiple ways to employ the concepts of internal control, the Green Book uses a hierarchical structure composed of 5 components and 17 related principles. The components represent the highest level of the hierarchy and must be operating together for a control system to effectively function.

The principles support the design and operation of the component with which it is associated. In some instances certain principles may be irrelevant to organizational objectives and can be disregarded.

How does this apply to American University? The direct relationship between organizational objectives and internal control makes successful grant management a necessity in increasing the scholarly impacts of faculty on their fields as dictated in American University’s strategic plan.

Therefore, over the next several issues of the OSP Monthly, we will explore the components and attributes of an internal control system. Check next month’s issue for an explanation of the Control Environment.

American University – Office of Sponsored Programs- May Awards Overview

In May 2015 (FY 2016), the Office of Sponsored Programs recorded the following grants for American University researchers.

PI: Kathleen De Cicco-Skinner
College of Arts and Sciences - Biology
Title: Tpl2 in Carcinogenesis-Related Inflammation
Sponsor: National Institutes of Health
Funds: $419,137.00

PI: Stephen Casey
College of Arts and Sciences - Mathematics & Statistics
Title: Conference: Sampling Theory and Applications (SampTA 2015)
Sponsor: Army Research Office
Funds: $18,500.00

PI: Philip Johnson
College of Arts and Sciences - Physics
Title: NIST SURF Program, Gaithersburg Campus
Sponsor: National Institute of Standards and Technology
Funds: $5,500

PI: Sarah Irvine Belson
College of Arts and Sciences - SETH
Title: Master Teacher Cadre (MTC) Program
Sponsor: District of Columbia Office of State Superintendent of Education
Funds: $409,195.00

PI: Eric Hershberg
Provost - Center for Latin American and Latino Studies
Title: Cuba Initiative
Sponsor: The Christopher Reynolds Foundation
Funds: $46,000.00

PI: Christopher Palmer
School of Communication - Center for Environmental Filmmaking
Title: Farming for the Future 3rd Film and General Operating Support
Sponsor: Prince Charitable Trusts
Funds: $25,000.00

PI: Christopher Palmer
School of Communication - Center for Environmental Filmmaking
Title: Film on Vanquished Disney Park
Sponsor: Prince Charitable Trusts
Funds: $4,500.00

PI: Lindsay Grace
School of Communication - Dean's Office
Title: Microgame Assessments
Sponsor: Educational Testing Service
Funds: $32,326.00

PI: Paul Wapner
School of International Service - Global Environmental Policy
Title: NEH Enduring Questions Course on Suffering
Sponsor: National Endowment for the Humanities
Funds: $21,993.00

PI: Simon Nicholson
School of International Service - Global Environmental Policy
Title: Forum for Climate Engineering Assessment
Sponsor: V. Kann Rasmussen Foundation
Funds: $750,000.00
PI: David Barno  
**School of International Service - U.S. Foreign Policy**  
**Title:** Crisis in Landpower: Building the Next U.S. Army  
**Sponsor:** Smith Richardson Foundation  
**Funds:** $138,323.00

PI: Claudia Martin  
**Washington College of Law - Academy on Human Rights & Humanitarian Law**  
**Title:** Legal Capacity Development in Cuba  
**Sponsor:** National Endowment for Democracy  
**Funding Source:** U.S. Department of State  
**Funds:** $99,808.00

PI: Diego Rodriguez-Pinzon  
**Washington College of Law - Academy on Human Rights & Humanitarian Law**  
**Title:** 2015 Inter-American Human Rights Moot Court Competition  
**Sponsor:** Institute of International Education  
**Funding Source:** Ford Foundation  
**Funds:** $50,000.00

PI: Jasmeet Sidhu-Kaur  
**Washington College of Law - Dean's Office**  
**Title:** The Squire Patton Boggs Foundation Public Policy Fellowship - 2015  
**Sponsor:** Squire Patton Boggs Foundation, The  
**Funds:** $5,000.00

---

**Congratulations to our 2015**  
Research Administration Certification (RAC) Graduates  
Marc Leblanc, Melissa Hippler, Sydney Blair, Bruce Douglas,  
Andrew Kada, UJ Sophia, Jesus Adame  
*Lunch & Certificate Presentation Ceremony*  

**Date:** June 29th 2015  
**Time:** 1:30 pm to 3:00pm  
**Location:** 4200 Wisconsin Ave NW Suite 300  
3rd Floor Conference Room
Creating an Employee-for-Life Culture
By: Anita R. Brown

Have you ever noticed that organizations with high employee turnover are always the first to complain loudest about how much it costs to find and retain good employees, and the last to take an objective look at just what might be their own shortcomings? Good employees stay with organizations that are good to them; not just in terms of pay and benefits, but also for the way they are treated, acknowledged and included.

It would be unrealistic for an organization to think that every person it hires will find his/her career niche there. However, it would also be shortsighted for an organization not to try to keep good employees as long as it can, and in the process, perhaps even influence their career choices.

It’s a Two-Way Street

Finding the right people for your organization is an expensive, labor-intensive endeavor. By the time you select the right people, you have already made a substantial investment in them. Like any long-term investment, you have to pay attention if you want a significant positive return. And the most cost-effective way to do this is to build meaningful and productive two-way communication.

Nothing, not even money, makes a person feel more important and appreciated than effective communication. Communication affects overall job commitment and satisfaction, and is often the primary reason employees choose to stay with or leave a company.

For this type of an open-dialogue culture to succeed, buy-in must start at the top and be continually reinforced at every opportunity and every level. This commitment goes way beyond simply communicating an organization’s internal news. Taken a step further, it is about listening to input and needs, responding quickly with relevant information, and providing excellent resources and management support. This is the level of focus a great organization should be using to maximize the lifetime value of each employee in order to shape an employee-for-life culture.

It Gets Personal as Well as Professional

Maximizing employee dedication requires performance-planning management. Performance management fosters empowerment. You want the kind of empowered people who know it is safe to exercise their talents and ideas and who are willing to be held accountable for their performance.

Senior managers foster empowerment by helping employees to establish job-related personal and professional goals that set the bar higher than the standard job description. Once set, the goals are routinely reviewed and revamped. Most importantly, when goals are achieved, employees are rewarded.

- Providing forums which they can voice their concerns and ideas for improvement
- Giving them the technology and other tools to perform their jobs
- Developing policies that help them achieve and maintain a balance between professional and personal obligations

When we consider that we spend more time with our colleagues than with our family and friends, it only makes sense that organizations should create healthy, robust environments that are more than just where people go to earn a paycheck. Job satisfaction and security are as much psychological as financial. An employee-for-life culture focuses on each employee as a person: both professionally and personally. If people are valued both professionally and personally, they will thrive and feel fulfilled. This is the ultimate secret to creating employees-for-life who are loyal to their organization and committed to promoting its success.

Good Managers Make the Difference

Behind every good manager is an organization that expects and rewards performance management. Happy senior managers are your internal sales people. They are your advocates, as well as your eyes and ears among the ranks. The more you hold them accountable for the performance of their staff, the more vested they will be in championing and protecting the organization’s image.
Creating an Employee-for-Life Culture continued....

Performance management is the core to creating and meeting expectations. It enables managers to get to know and accept each employee’s strengths and weaknesses and, in return, it enables employees to participate in the organization in ways that bring out the best in them and the institution.

Like a good marketing plan, a performance plan should be fluid, which means holding routine meetings to be sure that everyone is on track and no one is stagnating. This process gives management and staff an opportunity to review and evaluate established goals, evaluate strategies and, if necessary, revamp tactical plans.

A proven method for keeping management involved is to provide incentives. If managers and their direct-reports meet and exceed their goals, there is an end-of-year award. This keeps enthusiasm high and commitment focused, and it gives management another reason to keep in touch with their employees. This method has the additional benefit of minimizing internal competition; instead of competing with each other, employees are competing with themselves to improve and achieve more.

Do Unto Others

Without employees and customers there is no organization. Thus, it makes sense to afford the same care and value to your employees that you place on customers. Employees are an organization’s “human” capital, and should be viewed as the investors in, rather than assets of an organization. Like an excellent investment, if you want employees to appreciate in value, both personally and professionally, you have to give them the tools to grow. This means:

- Communicating how they can contribute to the vision of the organization.
- Defining expectations.
- Helping them formulate goals, then giving them the freedom and resources to achieve them.
- Holding them accountable for results.
- Reinforcing and expecting team-building.
- Encouraging new ideas and risk-taking.

Anita R. Brown is the Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies.

Updates & Tips from Grants & Contract Accounting (GCA)

Grants & Contracts Accounting (GCA) oversees the management of post-award administration sponsored project funds activity for the university. Our office commitment and support is to provide sound financial reporting to our research community as well as to our funding agencies (federal and non-federal).

UG Gives Pass-Through Entities Three Options for Subrecipients’ Indirect Costs

In the Uniform Guidance, at 2 CFR §200.331, the Office of Management and Budget imposes a new requirement on pass-through entities. A prime recipient must recognize indirect cost recovery by sub-recipients in sub-grant agreements, and OMB gives institutions three options for doing so.

The FAQ document, developed by the Council on Financial Assistance Reform (COFAR) on the Uniform Guidance, poses the question as to whether there is a limit on the number of layers of sub-recipients to which the requirement to pay indirect costs is applicable. The short answer is “no,” but COFAR adds that a particular federal award may have a limit.

Option #1: Honor the sub-recipient’s federally negotiated indirect cost rate agreement or NICRA.

If a sub-recipient has a NICRA, it must be recognized by the pass-through entity. And, unlike the situation that arises at the federal level where a federal agency head could establish that the NICRA is not going to be honored in a particular program, there’s no exception for pass-through entities. If a sub has a NICRA, it must be accepted.
Option #2: Use an indirect cost rate negotiated between the pass-through entity and the subrecipient.

In the uniform guidance, OMB does not really explore what’s involved in this process. Presumably, a prime could use a process similar to one used by the federal government.

There’s likely a lot of reluctance on the part of many institutions to get into the indirect cost negotiation business. If a pass-through entity, however, wants to consider the negotiation process, there are at least several tools available to help.

The first is the UG’s appendices. The indirect cost recovery policies were excised from the cost principals (Subpart E of the UG) and placed in the appendices (III–VII, covering individual types of grantees).

Three other documents that may be helpful to pass-through entities are the following:

1. Best Practices Manual for Reviewing College and University Long-Form Facilities & Administrative Cost Rate Proposals (HHS)
3. A Guide for Indirect Cost Rate Determination Based on the Cost Principles and Procedures Required by OMB Circular A-122 for Non-profit Organizations (DOL)

(These materials are available at www.ManagingFederalGrants.com in the Government Documents, ¶3300.)

These manuals will have to be revised in light of the UG; however, much of the fundamentals and approaches discussed in these guides will likely continue to be valid for some time.

Option #3: A sub-recipient could be granted a de minimum is 10% indirect cost rate.

This means that a sub-recipient would be allowed to charge an indirect cost rate of 10% of modified total direct costs. MTDC are defined in 2 CFR 200.68 as “all direct salaries and wages, applicable fringe benefits, materials and supplies, services, travel, and subawards and subcontracts up to the first $25,000 of each sub-award or subcontract.” Certain items, notably equipment and the major portion of a subgrant or subcontract, are excluded from MTDC.

How Will This Play Out?

There are many unanswered questions lingering surrounding the requirements of 2 CFR §200.330.

Perhaps the first question is whether an organization would be required to negotiate with every sub-recipient, or instead, can it simply require all of its subs to accept the de minimums rate.

It seems likely that a pass-through entity could (1) decide to negotiate with those parties that want to negotiate or (2) recognize a de minimums for those parties who don’t want to negotiate. However, if it decided to negotiate with one set of organizations and then refused to do so with others, this might not pass OMB scrutiny.

So one approach may be to allow sub-recipients to elect their preferred option and simply honor the de minimums in cases where a sub does not already have a NICRA. But one option that isn’t available to pass-throughs is to simply refuse to recognize indirect costs altogether.

The COFAR FAQ states, “If the sub-recipient already has a negotiated F&A rate with the federal government, the negotiated rate must be used. It also is not permissible for pass-through entities to force or entice a proposed sub-recipient without a negotiated rate to accept less than the minimum rate. Pass-through entities may, but are not required to, negotiate a rate with a proposed sub-recipient who asks to do so.”

A second unanswered question is the applicability of these requirements to foreign entities. OMB gives federal agencies the option of whether to impose these requirements of the uniform guidance on commercial and foreign entities receiving federal grants and cooperative agreements, including sub-recipient arrangements. There is, therefore, no across-the-board answer to this question.
A third issue that’s not addressed is acceptance by other funding sources of an F&A rate negotiated between one sub and one funding source that is not a federal agency. In other words, if a sub negotiates an indirect cost rate agreement with one of its primes, does a second institution have to accept the negotiated rate? On the face of the requirements, the answer would seem to be “no,” although the pass-through entity likely would not be prevented from doing so.

It might be worth noting that if a pass-through entity chooses to award a fixed price subaward (2 CFR 200.332), the cost principles should be used as a guide when proposing (pricing) the work that will be performed, but they are not formally used as compliance requirements for these types of awards.

In other words, according to the COFAR FAQ, a pass-through entity and the subrecipient “will use the principles along with historic information about the work to be performed to establish the amount that should be paid for the work to be performed. Once the price is established and the fixed amount award or sub-award is issued, payments are based on achievement of milestones.”

Research Matters
OSP Spotlight: Michael Bader

Each month, OSP Monthly highlights a specific American University faculty/staff member for their contributions in providing cutting-edge research or a research-related program that serves to create and advance knowledge, and enrich the resources of our educational community while answering and accelerating challenging issues we face today. This month, we are featuring Michael Bader, Assistant Professor Department of Sociology.

Q&A with Michael Bader

Q: Would you please describe your research projects and the technology used to conduct the research?

A: I have three related projects. The first studies the perceptions that people have about neighborhoods and how that influences where they would consider moving, where they search, and where they end up moving. The second studies how neighborhoods are changing -- in part through the moves from the first project and in part through births and deaths -- and what influence neighborhood changes have on being able to "age in place." The last uses Google Street View to summarize the physical qualities of neighborhoods to study how neighborhood physical characteristics affect whether people age healthfully, including how neighborhoods help people age in place.

Q: What applications does your research have and how did you develop an interest in this subject?

R: A: I see two broad applications for my research. First, I really want to identify causes of racial and economic segregation in metropolitan areas to help alleviate inequality. The second aspect of my work focuses on health inequality as a specific type of inequality that might come about because of residential segregation. My research examines how segregation comes about and provides evidence about new approaches to alleviate inequality.

I also hope that some of the technological and methodological tools that I develop in the process will help other researchers pursue similar topics or different topics with similar methods.

I went to college expecting to be an architect and actually graduated with degrees in architecture and art history. While I was a student, however, I realized that social processes that influenced how people used space -- and the inequalities that existed because of space -- interested me more than designing buildings. I realized that sociology and demography were great disciplines to help understand these questions.
I have been working on some of these issues since I was an undergrad (if one can call my undergraduate papers "work" in a meaningful intellectual sense). It’s funny, as I was packing up to move to AU, I found a copy of my application to graduate school and the writing sample I submitted examined patterns of racial and ethnic segregation around Houston. My dissertation included a similar map, made with much more statistically sophisticated methods, of the Chicago area. Now I just had a paper accepted that showed how segregation evolved in Houston and Chicago (along with New York and Los Angeles).

I started working on health inequality as a graduate student because I realized the potential for segregation and neighborhood inequality to create health inequality.

Q: At this stage of your career, who have you identified as a primary funder for your research?

A: Right now I have a project funded by the National Science Foundation. We received a grant to create a tool for survey interviews that shows respondents maps of the Chicago area and asks them a series of questions about communities, questions like: "Where have you ever lived?," "Where would you seriously consider moving?," "Where do you go on a regular basis for school or work?," and "Where would you never consider moving?" The tool allows interviewers to use a laptop that serves the questions to the tablet so that the respondent and interviewer can work together to get the best answers possible. We received enough money to develop the instrument and to pilot test it; we anticipate applying for funding to complete the survey in the coming year.

Q: Can you briefly describe the reporting requirements that the National Foundation has established?

A: They require annual reports and a final report. The biggest problem that I faced was understanding the cryptic e-mails that they sent. I could not exactly figure out what they wanted by when given, especially since we applied for a no-cost-extension. Speaking of which, applying for the no-cost-extension was probably the most stressful part of the whole process. I didn’t understand all of the requirements and ended up having to go back and ask the program officer for help after some things were due. Be sure to talk with the program officer BEFORE that happens!

Q: What was the proposal process like?

A: The proposal process was pretty straightforward except that we had to apply for funding in our own discipline as well as others to try to get the full amount that we were requesting. The sociologists who reviewed our proposal seemed to like it, but the geographers in the Geography section and econometricians in the Measurement, Methods, and Statistics section *did not*. We ended up getting a smaller amount of money than we originally requested, which allowed us to develop the instrument but not conduct the survey (which was part of our original proposal). In hindsight, it made sense: we wrote the proposal for sociologists and so did not incorporate as much of an interdisciplinary focus as we should have to get funding from multiple sections.

Q: Do you have a good relationship with your contact at the National Science Foundation?

A: Yes, although I must admit that I work with the contact there less than the Principal Investigator who is at another university.

Q: Do you have any advice for others that may want to do their own research, either in your field or elsewhere?

A: I have two pieces of advice that will hopefully help others. First, start early and expect rejection. We worked on the proposal that was ultimately funded for over two years. It was initially rejected at NIH before we even sent it to NSF. And we still need to apply for another round of funding in order to accomplish everything that we originally laid out. The process definitely made the ultimate project better and I am really excited with the progress that we have made, in part based on the suggestions of reviewers. Second, take advantage of the resources at AU to help write proposals. I have attended several of the workshops and they really help you develop a critical eye to hone your idea into something that reviewers understand and funders want to support.
Basics of Writing a Competitive Grant Proposal

By: Cynthia Muhammad, Senior Grants & Contract Manager

As you plan your research project, keep in mind the basic components of almost any grant proposal. You want the sponsor to be interested in reading the entire proposal so try to gain the reader’s (reviewer’s) interest, quickly. Tell a story. Tell a captivating story.

Summary: You need to demonstrate that you understand the mission of the funding agency and the types of projects that they support. Identify how the mission of your project and the funding agency mesh. Address key points in the program announcement and show how your project relates to the announcement. Show your enthusiasm and confidence in the project.

Organizational Information: Establish your organization’s credibility. Why are you the right organization to undertake this project? Have you had success with similar projects? Describe the unique features of your organization. Establish your personal credibility: Do you possess knowledge, skills and understanding different from your colleagues that assist in the undertaking of this project? Have you had success with a similar project?

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Concisely describe what you plan to do, your approach, who benefits and potential impacts.

Background and Purpose: Next describe the question, problem or need to be addressed. Make the argument (of why the question, problem or need is being addressed) intriguing to all who read your proposal. Briefly provide supporting documentation for the importance of addressing this question, problem or need. If you have statistical data, use it. Cite significant and compelling sources. Why does this project matter? Why is this project significant as compared to other projects? Make sure that you cite or refer to what others have accomplished relative to your project.

Goals, Objectives and Anticipated Outcomes: Outline your goals, objectives and research questions. Define the desired outcomes with specific, measurable objectives: What do you want to accomplish? How will you measure whether the project has indeed addressed the question, problem or need? A goal is statement describing a broad or abstract intent, state or condition. Goals are simply a clearer statement of the stated outcomes, specifying the accomplishments to be achieved if the stated outcomes are to become real. The target objectives are clearer statements of the specific activities required to achieve the goals. An objective is a statement of measurable outcomes that relate to the goal.

Methodology and Timelines: How will the project be carried out? Deeply consider the methods, rules and postulates you employ in your research relevant to your discipline. Create a realistic timeline in which you will complete each step or aim of the process. In many cases a table or visual in this section helps. Make sure you have connected the goals and objectives to your methodology and timeline.
Benefits and Impacts: Who benefits? What are the outcomes to be expected? How are the results disseminated? How does the project/research add new knowledge to your field? How does the project add new understanding to society as a whole? Adequately addressing these questions will produce a focused proposal displaying outcomes that have a direct benefit.

Evaluation and Assessment: Determine how you will evaluate the success of the project. How will you know whether the desired objectives have been reached? What methods and tools will you use to gather evaluative data?

Budget: Create a detailed budget. What expenses are related to the project? Consider accurately what is needed to successfully complete the project and all of the associated costs. Describe the future of the project. When the money from this funder is used up, how will the project continue? Is it a project that will require a continuous influx of money, or will it somehow become self-sustaining?

Language and Tone

Be clear and concise. Strive for a conversational tone. Address both experts and non-experts. Write to express, not to impress. Avoid long sentences. Avoid technical jargon. Write in an active voice, not a passive voice. Use assertive, positive and decisive language.

Guidelines and Instructions

Read the guidelines, program announcement, request for proposal and solicitations thoroughly. Closely follow the instructions of your potential funder. Do not take the position that the request of the funder is not important. Therefore, read the guidelines again, and follow the guidance and instructions of the potential funder, regardless of how mundane or obscure the instructions may appear. After all, your hope is that this organization will give you money for your research. Trust that they know what they want from the proposers.

Getting Funded

Compile your grant proposal bearing in mind the basic components discussed and win your grant funding. I wish you much success!
Funding Opportunities Organized by School/Department

Note: Please note that these offerings are a sampling of what is available via our search funding tools and serve as examples for you to consider. If you have not attended a “search funding tool” training session, we encourage you to do so. Performing an individualized search, tailored to your unit or specific research interests will provide the most exhaustive means of locating resources. Please contact Afelder@american.edu with any questions related to our search funding tools.

College of Arts & Sciences

National Science Foundation- Cultural Anthropology Program

Recognizing the breadth of the field’s contributions to science, the Cultural Anthropology Program welcomes proposals for empirically grounded, theoretically engaged, and methodologically sophisticated research in all sub-fields of cultural anthropology.

Deadline: August 15, 2015


Public education in the United States takes place within a complex network of state and local educational agencies (i.e., education systems), each of which is responsible for the educational outcomes of the schools and students that it serves. Through the Systems topic, the Institute supports a broad spectrum of research aimed at improving the operation of U.S. schools and districts, including research on school reform and reorganization, school performance and accountability systems, school finance and cost accounting, school choice, education leadership and management, as well as federal, state, and local education policies and practices.

The long-term outcome of this research will be an array of state- and district-wide policies, programs, and practices (e.g., organizational strategies, financial and management practices) that improve the operation of districts and schools in ways that improve student education outcomes.

Deadline: August 6, 2015

United States Department of Health and Human Services- Nutrition and Alcohol-Related Health Outcomes

This Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) encourages applications that propose to examine associations between nutrition and alcohol-related health outcomes in humans and animal models. The goal of this FOA is to stimulate a broad range of research on the role of nutrition in the development, prevention, and treatment of a variety of alcohol-related health outcomes including alcohol use disorder and chronic disease. Components of Participating Organizations National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) Office of Dietary Supplements (ODS) National Cancer Institute (NCI).

Deadline: July 5, 2015

Kogod School of Business

United States Department of Defense- Rapid Innovation Fund

The RIF Program was established to facilitate the rapid insertion of innovative small business technologies into military systems or programs that meet critical national security needs. RIF also intends to facilitate innovative technologies that show a clear transition path to fielding the technology into existing defense acquisition programs.

Deadline: June 15, 2015
Funding Opportunities Organized by School/Department

Note: Please note that these offerings are a sampling of what is available via our search funding tools and serve as examples for you to consider. If you have not attended a “search funding tool” training session, we encourage you to do so. Performing an individualized search, tailored to your unit or specific research interests will provide the most exhaustive means of locating resources. Please contact Afelder@american.edu with any questions related to our search funding tools.

National Science Foundation - Economics Program

The program supports research designed to improve the understanding of the processes and institutions of the U.S. economy and of the world system of which it is a part. This program also strengthens both empirical and theoretical economic analysis as well as the methods for rigorous research on economic behavior. It supports research in almost every area of economics, including econometrics, economic history, environmental economics, finance, industrial organization, international economics, labor economics, macroeconomics, mathematical economics, and public finance.

Deadline: August 18, 2015

School of Communication

Society for New Communications Research- Excellence in New Communications Awards

These prestigious awards honor the work of corporations, governmental and nonprofit organizations, educational institutions, media organizations and individuals who are innovating the use of digital and social media, mobile media, collaborative technologies and other ICT to improve business, culture and society.

Awards are granted in six divisions: Academic, Corporate, Government, Media, Nonprofit/NGO, and Technology Innovation, and six categories: Social Marketing / External Communications & Communities, Internal Social / Internal Online Communities, Online Video, Mobile Apps, Social Data Projects, and Innovation: Best New Digital & Social Technologies (Vendor Category).

Entrants are asked to submit case studies detailing their initiatives and technologies.

Deadline: September 5, 2015

United States Department of Health and Human Services - Implications of New Digital Media Use for Underage Drinking, Drinking-Related Behaviors, and Prevention Research

This Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) encourages R01 research grant applications from institutions/organizations that propose to investigate whether, and how, heavy involvement in new digital media usage, particularly social media and social networking sites, may influence adolescent alcohol use and drinking patterns, as well as drinking-related problems. This FOA also encourages applications proposing to explore the ways in which new digital media may be utilized as platforms for preventive interventions aimed at underage drinking and related problems.

Deadline: June 16, 2015
Funding Opportunities Organized by School/Department

Note: Please note that these offerings are a sampling of what is available via our search funding tools and serve as examples for you to consider. If you have not attended a “search funding tool” training session, we encourage you to do so. Performing an individualized search, tailored to your unit or specific research interests will provide the most exhaustive means of locating resources. Please contact Afelder@american.edu with any questions related to our search funding tools.

University of Georgia- George Foster Peabody Awards for Excellence in Electronic Media

Every year, all the submissions of TV shows, radio programs, and various types of web content are reviewed first by committees comprised of 90 faculty, staff, and students judges at the University of Georgia. These committees then pass their recommendations onto the Peabody Board, made up of a collection of scholars, media professionals, and journalists. This mix of top-level media professionals from a variety of backgrounds helps to ensure that winners appeal to a wide variety of viewers, rather than exclusively to media insiders. For a program to win, all 16 board members have to unanimously vote in favor of it receiving a Peabody.

Unlike many other high profile awards, there is no campaigning to win a Peabody. Once a program is submitted, it competes only on its merits. In addition to the concerns that would typically enter into consideration of a media award (production value, quality of the writing, originality, etc.) the Peabody judges must ask themselves: Does this story matter? Does it inform us as citizens? Does it help us empathize with one another?

Deadline: November 15, 2015 to January 15, 2016

School of International Services

United States Agency for International Development- USAID/Afghanistan Development Innovation Accelerator

This Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) seeks opportunities to co-create, co-design, and collaborate in basic and applied research to incorporate Science, Technology, Innovation and Partnerships (STIP) into the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Afghanistan Mission (USAID/Afghanistan) portfolio. USAID/Afghanistan invites organizations and companies to participate with USAID through co-creation, co-design, co-investment and collaboration in response to a Critical Development Challenge Addendum issued under this BAA, as described below, to provide innovations and technologies that further USAID/Afghanistan’s development objectives. These innovations and technologies will further the U.S. Government’s commitment to address critical development challenges in Afghanistan.

Deadline: March 31, 2016

National Science Foundation- Political Science Program

The program supports scientific research that advances knowledge and understanding of citizenship, government, and politics. Research proposals are expected to be theoretically motivated, conceptually precise, methodologically rigorous, and empirically oriented. Substantive areas include, but are not limited to, American government and politics, comparative government and politics, international relations, political behavior, political economy, and political institutions. In recent years, program awards have supported research projects on bargaining processes; campaigns and elections, electoral choice, and electoral systems; citizen support in emerging and established democracies; democratization, political change, and regime transitions; domestic and international conflict; international political economy; party activism; and political psychology and political tolerance. The program also has supported research experiences for undergraduate students and infrastructural activities, including methodological innovations, in the discipline.

Deadline: August 15, 2015
Funding Opportunities Organized by School/Department

Note: Please note that these offerings are a sampling of what is available via our search funding tools and serve as examples for you to consider. If you have not attended a “search funding tool” training session, we encourage you to do so. Performing an individualized search, tailored to your unit or specific research interests will provide the most exhaustive means of locating resources. Please contact Afelder@american.edu with any questions related to our search funding tools.

Rockefeller Brothers Fund- Peacebuilding

The Fund’s program aspires to strengthen grassroots constituencies for peace and to connect them with policymaking on the regional and international levels. It aims to understand the conditions that lead to violence and the processes that support durable peace in order to identify innovative solutions to the most pressing drivers of insecurity. The program is currently focused on the following conflict areas: Israel-Palestine, the U.S.-Iran relationship, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Western Balkans. The program's grantmaking focuses on conflicts that have a disproportionate influence on international peace and security. It works closely with the Fund's Pivotal Place programs, especially in the Western Balkans, and with the Global Governance portfolio of the Democratic Practice program. The Fund places particular importance on elevating the role of women and young leaders in international peacebuilding and conflict transformation efforts. Advancing Just and Durable Peace: The Fund will pursue the following interrelated strategies with respect to select conflicts: - Supporting innovative and collaborative approaches and policies for conflict prevention, management, and transformation at the multilateral, regional, and national levels. - Strengthening constituencies and political will for conflict transformation and durable peace. - Exploring solutions to emerging transnational threats and drivers of conflict. The program is currently focusing a significant portion of its grantmaking on the wider Middle East.

Deadline: Continuous

School of Public Affairs

United States Department of Justice- NIJ FY 15 Building and Enhancing Criminal Justice Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships

NIJ is interested in funding multiple criminal justice research projects involving researcher-practitioner partnerships as well as capturing detailed descriptions of these collaborations. Other NIJ solicitations often encourage researcher-practitioner partnerships; however, this solicitation is directly aimed at supporting criminal justice research and evaluation activities that include a researcher-practitioner partnership component. Within the context of the proposed research or evaluation project, the partnerships can be new or ongoing. Results from these projects should lead to better criminal justice policy, practice, and research, including for the participating practitioner partner. For the purpose of this solicitation, practitioner or criminal justice practitioner or practice-based organization refers to public, non-profit, or community-based agencies at federal, State, and local levels directly involved in:

- Law enforcement; Corrections, including pretrial, parole, probation, supervised release, and reentry; the criminal judicial system; the juvenile justice system; forensic sciences for criminal justice purposes; crime victim services and programs; and crime and violence prevention programs

Deadline: April 20, 2016
Funding Opportunities Organized by School/Department

Note: Please note that these offerings are a sampling of what is available via our search funding tools and serve as examples for you to consider. If you have not attended a “search funding tool” training session, we encourage you to do so. Performing an individualized search, tailored to your unit or specific research interests will provide the most exhaustive means of locating resources. Please contact Afelder@american.edu with any questions related to our search funding tools.

National Science Foundation- Law & Social Sciences (LSS)

The Law & Social Sciences Program considers proposals that address social scientific studies of law and law-like systems of rules. The Program is inherently interdisciplinary and multi-methodological. Successful proposals describe research that advances scientific theory and understanding of the connections between law or legal processes and human behavior. Social scientific studies of law often approach law as dynamic, made in multiple arenas, with the participation of multiple actors. Fields of study include many disciplines, and often address problems including though not limited to: Crime, violence and punishment; economic issues; governance; legal decision making; legal mobilization and conceptions of justice; litigation and the legal profession.

Deadline: August 3, 2015

United States Department of Health and Human Services- Public Health Impact of the Changing Policy/Legal Environment for Marijuana

This initiative encourages research on the impact of changing marijuana policies and laws on public health outcomes, including marijuana exposure among children, adolescents, and adults; other licit and illicit drug use;... more » education and professional achievement; social development; risky behaviors (e.g., drugged driving); mental health; HIV, etc.

Deadline: July 5, 2015

Washington College of Law

United States Department of Health and Human Services- Centers of Excellence in Ethical, Legal and Social Implications (ELSI) Research

The National Human Genome Research Institute (NHGRI) is soliciting grant applications for the support of Centers of Excellence in Ethical, Legal and Social Implications (ELSI) Research (CEERs). The CEER Program is designed to support the establishment of sustainable trans-disciplinary research teams with the expertise and flexibility to anticipate, conduct research on, and quickly address a range of cutting edge ethical, legal, and social issues related to genetics and genomics. The Program is intended to create new research opportunities that cross disciplinary boundaries among investigators in diverse fields, such as the genomic sciences, clinical research, clinical and health policy, ethics, law, the humanities, economics, political science, anthropology and other basic social sciences. In addition to conducting trans-disciplinary research, Centers will disseminate their research findings and engage in other activities that facilitate the utilization of their findings and deliberations in the development of research, health and public policies and practices regarding the use of genomic information and technologies. Finally, Centers will contribute to developing the next generation of ELSI researchers.

Deadline: July 15, 2015
Funding Opportunities Organized by School/Department

Note: Please note that these offerings are a sampling of what is available via our search funding tools and serve as examples for you to consider. If you have not attended a “search funding tool” training session, we encourage you to do so. Performing an individualized search, tailored to your unit or specific research interests will provide the most exhaustive means of locating resources. Please contact Afelder@american.edu with any questions related to our search funding tools.

Law School Admission Council- Research Grant Program

The program funds research on a wide variety of topics related to the mission of LSAC. Specifically included in the program's scope are projects investigating precursors to legal training, selection into law schools, legal education, and the legal profession. To be eligible for funding, a research project must inform either the process of selecting law students or legal education itself in a demonstrable way.

The program welcomes proposals for research proceeding from any of a variety of methodologies, a potentially broad range of topics, and varying time frames. Proposals will be judged on the importance of the questions addressed, their relevance to the mission of LSAC, the quality of the research designs, and the capacity of the researchers to carry out the project. LSAC's membership includes law schools in the United States, Canada, and Australia. Comparative proposals about topics outside the United States, Canada, and Australia are welcome, but they must include some explicit connection to legal education or the legal profession within those countries.

Deadline: August 15, 2015

United States Department of Justice- Office for Victims of Crime Supporting Male Survivors of Violence Demonstration Initiative

The demonstration, undertaken with Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, seeks to improve the responses to male survivors of violence, particularly boys and young men of color, and their families and to dedicate technical assistance to support these efforts. Among other things, the demonstration evaluator will:

- Determine appropriate baseline data points and study measures across each of the sites for a demonstration-level evaluation.
- Independently assess the fidelity of the implementation of the strategies identified by each of the demonstration sites to improve their services for male survivors of violence and their families.

Deadline: July 2, 2015
Encourage those who are not on the newsletter subscription list to join!
To receive OSP Monthly, please send an email to listserv@listserv.american.edu
with the following information in the body:
- Subscribe
- Newsletter-L
- First and Last Name

• Are you interested in being added to the wait list for our next RAC session?
• Do you have a story or article idea? Our standard content deadline is the 20th of the month prior.
• Do you have an “OSP Spotlight on Research” interview suggestion?
• Do you need to scheduled a “One on One” refresher session for one of our search funding tool databases? Grant Forward, Pivot COS or The Foundation Directory Online (Professional version)?

If you need assistance with any of the above items, please contact OSP’s Communications Manager, Ms. Akidah Felder via e-mail Afelder@american.edu

What to expect in next month’s OSP Monthly:
- Vice Provost’s Corner
- Why Academics Have a Hard Time Writing Good Grant Proposals courtesy of SRA
- Funding Opportunities
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