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# Jake Maas

I want to tell you a bit about the resources available at UGA to find funding for your hard to fund research projects, and resources present in this room are Office of Proposal Enhancement, and that’s me and Rebecca. Raise your hand Dr. Rebecca Terns, and Claire Bolton. And we have Susana Calvert and in our panel is Matt Pruitt, down at the end. He is the Assistant Director of Foundation Relations for Corporate and Foundation Relations. We’re all available to help you in our particular domains to find funding for your hard to fund projects. And we don’t expect to be able to come up with all of the answers to all of the questions today, but together I hope we can start a conversation about this topic. Which is strategies to find funding for controversial and diverse—and I would add unusual and outside the box—research.

Just real briefly, to tie these things together a little bit, why are these things, these types of research so hard to fund? And it could be because they’re politically or socially controversial, whether they’re inherently, you know, perennially controversial, like abortion or due to the capricious winds of political change. So, climate change, gun control, things like that. Because if they deal with sensitive or protected populations, it can be because they combine ideas from different disciplines in ways that no one has done before, and it can be difficult to convince people of the merits of those kinds of approaches. Or perhaps because while there is the need or imperative that you’ve identified for your research, there isn’t, for whatever reason, a market for it, to use a crass, capitalist term. And the question is, is there a market you just don’t know about, or do you have to sort of create that market in order to find funding, or is there a market at all?

# Jake Maas (continued)

So I’ve asked our panelists to share their thoughts and stories about their struggles and successes in finding funding for their controversial, unusual, outside the box research, and also as we discussed, how they framed or pitched their research projects to increase their chances of funding, and to consider both the logistical and rhetorical issues involved in presenting the research and framing it for a particular audience. So those are the questions I gave them. And without any further adieu, I will introduce the panel.

We have, from me going left, Mandy Joye. she is the Athletic Association Professor in Franklin Arts and Sciences in the Department of Marine Sciences. She’s an expert in biogeochemistry and microbial ecology, and works in open ocean and costal ecosystems. Her interdisciplinary work bridges the fields of chemistry, microbiology, and geology, and has been funded by the NSF, EPA, and the Gulf of Mexico Research Initiative and NOAA among others. Her work assessing the impacts of climate change along the Georgia coast showed for the first time that even small changes in temperature affect the ability of super-sensitive microorganisms to degrade organic carbon in costal sediments. She’s also acutely interested in understanding how the rising sea levels caused by climate change may affect coastal wetlands. Dr. Mandy Joye’s research related to the 2010 Gulf oil spill has examined the distribution of deepwater plumes of oil and gas, and her group continues to measure the activities of the microorganisms that break down oil and gas, the necessity impacts of the spill on bluewater [inaudible 3:49] ecosystems. [Inaudible 3:54]. I’ve learned something new already.

# Jake Maas (continued)

Next, Andrea Swartzendruber is Assistant Professor in the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics in the College of Public Health. Her research focuses on women’s sexual and reproductive health, and maternal and child health. In line with the [inaudible 4:15] perspective, much of Dr. Swartzendruber’s research focuses on health behavior, health services, and outcomes during critical periods and life transitions, particularly adolescence and young adulthood, pregnancy, and parenting. She has current NIH funding to study the impact of drug use on HIV, STI risk across development among African American female adolescents, and is a co-investigator within Emory’s new RISE Center, that stands for the Center for Reproductive Health Research In The Southeast, which seeks to provide new scientific knowledge about the social determinants of reproductive health in the southeast and identify evidence based strategies to improve access to family planning care.

Next down the line is Jo Walther. He is the Associate Professor in the School of Environmental, Civil, Agricultural, and Mechanical Engineering. He is the founding director of the Engineering Education Transformations institute, EETI, an integrative unit that builds shared capacity and social capital around the scholarship, teaching, and learning of engineering. He is the co-leader, with Nicholas Sutaka, of the Collaborative Lounge for Understanding Society and Technology [inaudible 5:24] that it’s a lounge cluster, it just sounds so friendly. Which is a transdisciplinary research group at UGA that is committed to investigating the social and environmental justice dimensions of engineering education and practice. Dr. Jo Walther has two current NSF funded collaborations with the school of social work focused on the psychosocial formation of engineers. The empathy project seeks to determine how empathy influences the process and experience of engineering students learning in professional formation. The second project, which I think of as the Shame Project, because it matches with empathy, is generating robust insight into shame, which represents ubiquitous but seemingly invisible phenomenon that pervades both individual experience and the overall culture of engineering programs, and is likely a key mechanism of hurting socialization processes, creating deeply [inaudible 6:14].

And finally, Matt Pruitt is the Assistant Director of Foundation Relations, with Corporate and Foundation Relations at UGA. His work focuses on building relationships with foundations working to match their [inaudible 6:26] with the opportunities to support the important work being done by faculty, staff, and students at the University of Georgia. He works for the university’s colleges and units to stay apprised of their projects and priorities, while seeking the build the important networks and connections to foundations likely to support those efforts. Before joining the office of corporate and financial relations, Matt worked as an educator teaching in [inaudible 6:47] high schools in the Athens area. He started his professional career as a journalist, working for a daily newspaper, and became the primary reporter on issues related to healthcare and medicine. So I’m going to ask everybody on the list to spend a few minutes each talking about their experiences and then we’ll [inaudible 7:07] questions. So whoever wants to go first can go first.

# Dr. Mandy Joye

Thanks for inviting me. Thank you, Jake, and thanks to all of you for coming. So my work is very interdisciplinary, and I just want to say controversial in some respects. So I’m going to talk about two things: One is sort of the interdisciplinary angle and what is the political controversial angle. With respect to interdisciplinary science, many of the most rewarding projects that I’ve ever done have been projects that got completely slammed by the National Science Foundation, or [inaudible 7:57] the first two were [inaudible 8:00] because they were too interdisciplinary and too risky and too dangerous [inaudible 8:14] invest for $1,000 [? 8:16]. So I think about 10 or 12 years ago, I finally figured out, not a magical recipe, but an effective strategy to convince program managers to at least give the project a chance. And what it did, it involved basically mining NSF databases, and looking to contact people who had gotten what I felt were pretty out-there projects funded at a high level, [inaudible 8:49] you know [inaudible 8:49] biology, or [inaudible 8:51] as is my case.

# Dr. Mandy Joye (continued)

And what I was able to sort of figure out is most people had had the same experience that I did, and we had all been using these strategies that were fairly ineffective, I would say, and that is we basically went around the [inaudible 9:05] who submitted them, we thought they were awesome. We were devastated when they didn’t get funded, but I didn’t really recognize the importance of doing the legwork that [inaudible 9:15]. That legwork involves developing a very detailed relationship with the [inaudible 9:21]. Not to put yourself in a position of being the favorite or getting preferential treatment, but letting them know that you’re working hard on the problem and really giving them a little bit more background on the problem. And I never did this by sending this e-mail, or, you know, calling them. What I did was I bugged the heck out of them at conferences, whether it was the AAAS [? 9:44] or the American Society of Microbiology meeting, or an Oceanographic and Charting meeting, I would seek these people out and talk to them [inaudible 9:54] conference, because that seemed to be where they were the least ruffled and irritated. They can just sort of pick their ear for a half hour on an odd project. And sometimes I would drag them to a poster that I was giving, or drag them to a student’s talk to hear, you know, look at the [inaudible 10:15] that we have, this is so incredible, and I couldn’t control the proposal because we were [inaudible 10:19] the pages, just to let them know the excitement. They don’t really—it’s really difficult to articulate the passion that you have for your work in a proposal, because it’s flat on a page. It’s not three-dimensional. They don’t hear your voice talking. But when you get them face-to-face, and this is hard on the phone, too, and it certainly doesn’t work in e-mail. That always comes back wrong. But if you do it face-to-face at a conference, it’s a very effective strategy.

# Dr. Mandy Joye (continued)

We had one project where it was a deep sea microbial [inaudible 10:51] emerging frontiers [inaudible 10:53] and it was a fairly large science and field base program. Had a not of submarine dives, so it was super—the field program was about three times as expensive [inaudible 11:02]. And they were sort of balking at the idea of paying that much money for a field program. So I convinced the [inaudible 11:09] manager that this was really relevant because not just working the ocean, but astrobiology and [inaudible 11:18] and all these other, NASA has a [inaudible 11:21] fund, and she basically—that proposal went really well, and it was always really just the dive time, the ship time that killed it, because it was so expensive. And she basically, she was in [inaudible 11:33] biology, and she basically worked that deal with the [inaudible 11:37] people and single-handedly got that project funded. She felt the passion, I spent four hours at an ASM meeting talking about that and driving her to five or six posters and to see this talk, and by the end of it, she probably just wanted to get rid of me. She thought it was a super nice project, and she singlehandedly got it funded. So those relationships with program [inaudible 12:04] and getting to know them at conference I think is really, really important. [inaudible 12:05] a face to match with your name, and it’s much more than [inaudible 12:11] so I think that would be one of the [inaudible 12:15]. And in terms of the political issue, that’s something that we’re really facing now in the climate science arena, because I’ve been told by program managers at DOE as recently as two weeks ago to not even bother resubmitting a proposal that reviewed rather well last year, because there was no way that anything could get done right now. Anything. And so the recommendation that I got from him and from some people at NOA has been to really try to make connections with foreign project foundations, and that’s what I’m trying to do now. And that’s difficult in many respects, because they typically have missions, and if your program is at all outside their little box, they don’t even want to talk to you about it. And not because they don’t think what you’re doing is super interesting and super cool, but because they have, at federal funding agencies, there’s a lot of flexibility in, does this proposal meet our funding mandate? Is this right in line with what we’re supposed to fund? Foundations have a much more rigid structure in terms of flexibility. At least that’s my experience with the Science Foundation in [inaudible 13:26]. They have, if you fit into their box, great. If you’re two millimeters on the outside of their box, not so much. I really wish I could help you, but—so I haven’t cracked that yet, the code. But I think we’re getting closer to cracking the code. But there, you know, and many of these foundations don’t even allow you, you know, they don’t take unsolicited proposals. They don’t want you cold calling them. So in those cases what I’ve done is I’ve taught to other people who are funded by [inaudible 13:57] foundation or the Science Foundation, and what you have to do is get your friends, talk with them like did you know that [inaudible 14:03]. Why did she [inaudible 14:04] that? That’s crazy interesting. And when enough people say that, then they are more prone to maybe call you up and say, could you please submit a proposal? But again, it comes back to personal relationships. Do they know the people that they’re funding? They literally make decisions based on the realms of science, the impact of the science, and they take the recommendations of people [inaudible 14:27]. I don’t think there’s a magic formula. I think tenacity and not getting upset when the door slams shut in your face is really important. And if you’ve got a really, really good idea, don’t ever get up on it. Because that brine project that I mentioned in the beginning, that was six submissions before it got funded, so three different programs [inaudible 14:49]. And it reviewed incredibly well every time, and it would have been so easy to just walk away from it because it was clear that they were not going to fund it. And the fact that I got it backdoored through this interdisciplinary mission, not even oceans sciences, still is astonish. I don’t know how that happened. Because that was sort of the last, we were really going to try to go to NASA and cut it back into a teeny part of [inaudible 15:14] but just sticking with it and trying to work every possible angle really made it happen.

# Dr. Andrea Swartzendruber

Thank you. I feel like you all might be my tribe in that, you know, having ideas that might be outside the box and still wanting to pursue them and having that drive, I’m rather new at UGA. I’ve been here for just a year and a half. I’m an assistant professor. I kind of feel like what I want personally for my own goal is to have work that is meaningful and satisfying and rewarding to me. And even if it’s not, okay, this [inaudible 15:56] is written, so I’m going to write a proposal that matches that—I want to do work that I feel is important. And we’ll see how it goes, frankly. So I have current NIH funding, I’m also funded by an anonymous foundation. And some of this is to talk about how this actually happened to me, and I kind of got lucky. So there was a foundation that had approached colleagues about submitting a proposal for a new center, and then I was [inaudible 16:26] that I do in reproductive health and of women’s health, I was invited to submit a proposal to be considered within this new center to be funded by the center. A number of proposals were put forward and lucky enough, I was among the few that were chosen first for funding. So the work, I don’t know if any of you saw this past week or if you even watch, Last Week Tonight with John Oliver, and he had a segment this past week on crisis pregnancy centers. Generally there’s been really low awareness about what these centers are, but they have been widely criticized for giving the appearance that they are regional, comprehensive reproductive health clinic when in fact they are religiously affiliated, and their mission is to dissuade people who might be considering abortion from seeking abortion. Their tactics have often been described as coercive, as deceptive, and they’ve been widely criticized for providing false and misleading health information in service of their goal of preventing people from seeking abortion care. So we have a relatively new law in Georgia. Our state is publically funding crisis pregnancy centers at a couple million dollars per year. So my work, I’ve done some study on crisis pregnancy center websites in Georgia, and the work trauma-informed I’m funded through the foundation is to [inaudible 18:08] study, examination of the quality of services provided by crisis pregnancy centers. So I guess my research in that regard would fall into the politically challenging bucket of things. Obviously we’re in the south, it’s probably no secret that our state can be described as hostile to women’s reproductive health services and promoting health. So it’s been interesting to just kind of learn more about the world of foundation funding. There are some upsides in that typically, right, you need to fall within what they want to, in my experience, what they want to fund. There’s some flexibility in terms of funding levels, like the foundation that I’m working with just wants good work, really is focused on getting outcomes that make a real world impact. And so whatever it takes to do that, then put that [inaudible 19:16] where the downside is different realms than the federal funding mechanism, the indirect costs are much less. I mean, I’m still trying to figure that out. Frankly, as a new assistant professor, how important that is, in my whole portfolio of work, what does that look like, and are people concerned about the indirect funding levels that I’m bringing in? so that is something that I guess is still a question mark for me, and I’m trying to frankly figure out. Because I became known to the foundation, I recently received an invitation to respond to a new RFP. So again, it’s like you become known to a particular organization. I didn’t know they were going to have an RFP, you know, so they called me to respond to it, and obviously not just me. They were sending out to other groups as well. Some of my colleagues at another institution I know are also considering a proposal, and I will likely be part of their proposal. I talked to [inaudible 20:23] just recently and kind of was like ehh, I don’t know if I should submit something. And I’m like oh, may as well, you know, they’re interested but being rather new to UGA it’s not like I have tons of publications with my potential colleagues that I would involve in this research. So I’m kind of like, I guess I’m actually intimidated, you know, in comparison to this other institution where they are in a higher [inaudible 20:49] they have been more stable, they do have a demonstrative level of publications together. And what the funder told me was that you can turn that into a strength, right? So we are interested in developing capacity at local levels at new institutions, right? So if you want to use this as an opportunity to show that you are building up some institutional support capacity in this particular field or area of interest, that would be seen as a plus to us. So much different review process than I particularly [inaudible 21:29] or even expecting to find based on my [inaudible 21:33] types of funding sources.

# Dr. Jo Walther

So maybe trying to add to some of the things that was being said. So when [inaudible 21:45] told me that I was doing controversial research, that got me thinking lsi 21:50] trying to think about what some the many strategies and things are that have sort of ventured at in some cases being successful in terms of funding. So maybe as the other side to what Mandy was talking about with the sort of more direct lobbying around the project and efforts is sort of also I think another piece of becoming really familiar and getting into sort of the discourse of that community or that bubble, [inaudible 22:19] some way, but all the different maybe research communities, and trying to see that from a sort of meta perspective of [inaudible 22:28] a bit, you know, you can sort of get trapped into all these things, but participating and becoming familiar with it and then sort of stepping back and saying what are some of the bigger pictures here? And through that, getting away from the responding [inaudible 22:46] write something that fits that, just saying how can I maybe—how do my interests sort of fit into that, or how college that be offered up in the terms of some of the discourse. That doesn’t mean lying about it, but it means maybe also thinking more broadly about your project. So when we were talking about the project of empathy and engineering, a lot of people don’t—this is sort of strange, social work and engineering is even stranger, you know, it is what it is, and it’s [inaudible 23:16] and we see the value in that. and then looking at sort of the broader discussion of sort of STEM education being a national priority and there’s somewhat recognition of the broader skills that engineers need, you know, the aspects of the work that we do around it either concerns special communication and understand that in different ways. So it’s not sort of lying and using other people’s words to say yeah, this is actually what we’re doing, but taking new ideas or making room for some of those broader themes to take hold and be recognized by other people. So it’s not just gaming the system, but also in a way, challenging yourself to think more broadly about your project and how you can anchor that and how that can be sort or maybe contribute to the larger discourse. And that ultimately means that that can be—can also be receptive, but it also means you’re living with the remaining tension [inaudible 24:16] where in engineering education, we’re doing a project that is around recognizing the value of stakeholders in a broader perspective, and larger funding that goes into preparing sort of students to become valuable contributors to the military industrial complex. I shouldn’t have said that.

# Unknown Speaker

No, it’s controversial.

# Dr. Jo Walther

And there is that tension that is going to be there and finding a space where the truth can coexist sort of in your own work is kind of a challenge, and an ongoing challenge. One of the sort of strategies that [inaudible 25:00] need with that is to find sort of a strong community, or a team that you do that with. So having people with other disciplines could give you, you know, allows you to have a broader view on this, and then you’re sort of not the individual researchers of—hitting your head against the wall in your own research community, but allows you to have support and also a broader view on this. And I think that could be valuable to persist [inaudible 25:28] tensions and trying to navigate those. And that’s what leads me to my other point that I was thinking about is that a lot of these things require us to take a longer term view. So building collaborations that have this quality also on a personal level to sustain some of those challenges you will encounter takes time and takes effort but is really rewarding. It is a little bit at odds with some of the measures of success and performance criteria that we sort of have at this university in spite of all the talk about interdisciplinary programs, it just takes a lot longer. This colleague and I, [inaudible 26:06] in social work, we’ve been at this for eight years, and we haven’t turned up publications or dollars at the rate that you can do that when you find a few friends who are doing the exactly the same thing you’re doing. So that’s changing to, [inaudible 26:21] at an institutional level. Part of it, a longer term view that you can also—it’s also a sort of actual strategy is to, if you have a slow development process of these ideas, you can sort of be intentional of how you, [inaudible 26:36] research community around this, or having thinking purposefully about conference papers and how you can sort of create a recognition maybe for some of your ideas and provide major points for later proposals. Some of these strategies of getting sort of the landscape of the discourse and then also responding to that and sort of laying the groundwork for the later proposal is maybe an interesting way to think about that. And then the other realization that I had in reflecting on this is that in proposing something that is controversial or unconventional in the research community, it’s sort of a departure point is no, I’ve got to tell them that this needs to be done this way [inaudible 27:22]. And it ends up being helpful. So what I would offer is to sort of think about, and this is interesting that the project is on there too, empathy as a way of understanding the responses to your proposal. I mean, there are people who’ve invested their careers in a particular version of this and it’s very challenging, so rather than sort of the activist in me that wants to say no this should be different, you know, to really think about how will this land, and in a genuine way what are some of the perspectives that can be taken on this, and that sort of helps you get over the soap box-y approach to some of that that is just probably not a productive way of offering it up to a community. So that’s kind of a different way of maybe thinking about offering a controversial idea in a way that makes connections rather than emphasizes sort of tensions in the—and then ultimately sometimes you have to take sort of a long view and persist on some of the challenges of talking about things that were more or less successful. We recently [inaudible 28:33] project—we can’t call it that anymore, but it was a very long, drawn out review process that was very [inaudible 28:41] lots of stuff happened and was changed and it resulted ultimately in us having to re-write the title and the abstract for that project to remove the word shame and emotion, which is really hard when this is sort of the subject of your study. So it’s an unusual project or topic and it’s sort of a taboo in itself, and it doesn’t fit with some of the more dominant ways of thinking about engineering education as producing those—sort of that complex. And that tension, it was recognized and it definitely sort of remained in the program, [inaudible 29:18] did sort of a good job, and then has his or her sort of responsibilities and worries about progression also and things looking into that. So it was a bizarre experience to say kind of like that the program office supported it, you know, after a very long process, you know, and then the way it’s sort of represented to the world is quite different as a direct result of some of the political changes [inaudible 29:42] but can be interesting.

# Matt Pruitt

I’m Matt Pruitt, Foundation Relations. I’m kind of the odd man out here, obviously intellectually and by accomplishment, I’m very much the odd person out. Thanks, Jake. [Laughter]. [inaudible 30:03] folks who are way more intelligent and way more accomplished than I am. So I think it’s only right that I spend the least time and try to keep mine the briefest and try to maintain my place here. So the model for our job is to engage private philanthropic foundations, which we kind of referenced here. And so there are some pros and cons when working with those. I would say just up front, one of the biggest, not even negatives, but things people just recognize is typically the funding levels are going to be lower than these giant federal grants, that if you’re looking for $1M, $1.5M to fund your work for five years, [inaudible 30:28] most of the foundations I work with aren’t going to do that typically, and some of the larger ones like [inaudible 30:45] are kind of more like working with a federal agency in a lot of ways. So the dollar amounts may be smaller, although they can grow and occasionally we’ll hit instances where a foundation is in a position and ready to give a larger gift, and we can match up the timing pretty well there.

# Matt Pruitt (continued)

On the flipside, I would say that there is a little more chance to build personal relationships with these folks at the foundations, and that can go a long way. It’s not, it doesn’t mean that we could funnel through anything that we want, but before we have staff here at the university doing this and because we’re a huge university with a huge alumni network, a lot of times we can find connections to these folks, or just because of the UGA name, if we write somebody or call and say hey, I’d like to just come share with you some good work we’re doing that we think you might be interested in, they’ll give us an audience just because we’re the state’s flagship university [inaudible 31:40] and those kind of things. So that ability to kind of have a little more human contact, instead of even the larger private foundations, and a lot of them are, send us an e-mail, don’t call us, don’t contact us, if we’re interested we’ll call you. But some of the mid-size and smaller ones, I can go sit in front of them and talk with them. And that’s important because I’ve had even a lot of foundation people say you need to research what our foundation says they say or says they fund, and then what they actually fund. And sometimes those are two kind of different things. Obviously you can do that through 990s and tax records, but when it helps to kind of have a personal connection with somebody, and really early in the process be able to get some feedback and say is this something that you think has any traction? And they can say yes or no. And if yes, then you can figure out the best way to guide [inaudible 32:32]. So that’s kind of the trade off there. The smaller dollar amounts, but maybe a little bit more chance for engagement. And I would say while it’s true that a lot of them increasingly do have pretty narrowly defined parameters of what they want to see, some of them also are willing to at least hear you out and say, I have this project, I know it’s maybe at the margins of what your interest and focus areas are, but can we talk about it? And they’ll allow you to do that. again, the good things about it are the bad things about it too. I would say the process for approval is not as transparent, well, would you consider [inaudible 33:14] transparent in their review process, at least you kind of know what that process is. With a lot of private foundations you’re working with one person or program officer or sometimes in smaller foundations the president of the foundation even. And you feel good about something and it goes into that meeting room with the trustees, and something happens in there and they gave it the thumbs down. and again, if we had a good personal relationship there, sometimes we can get some good feedback on why that is, but that process of what happens in that boardroom isn’t always as transparent as it might be in a public agency or the feedback kind of can be a crapshoot sometimes. It really depends on the relationship you have with that foundation. So again sometimes it’s a little mysterious, but at least if you have a connection there, you have a chance to kind of advocate a little bit more than you might in some of the larger agencies, and maybe to get some feedback. And for the foundations I’ve worked with a couple of years and may have gone through a couple of grant cycles, you can usually get some pretty honest feedback on the front end. They say no, don’t put together a full proposal for this, this isn’t anything that we’re going to be interested in. And on the back end too, it didn’t work out, you can say look, here’s what you’re missing. Maybe next year we’ll look at it, or sometimes the honest answer, we got a lot of requests this cycle and can’t fund them all, and yours kind of got left on the floor there. And the last thing I’ll really say, and again, I’d be ha to answer any questions, is that when it comes to the idea of controversial or diverse, and I’ll start with diverse, I mean, my office is central to the university, so I mean we work with foundations that fund a wide range of interests and we work with schools, colleges and units that are doing all sorts of different things. So we have the capacity to do that. And for controversy I would say what’s controversial for some people is standard practice for another, right? And climate change is an easy example. In some circles, climate change is a controversial topic, but I know at least one pretty large foundation in the state has decided they’re going to make their entire focus on finding climate change solutions. So to them, that’s not a controversial issue. And I think we’re starting to see in the best, since 2016, more private foundations looking to kind of fill the spaces that maybe the federal agencies won’t anymore, or don’t. So obviously that’s a long process and only some of these foundations have the capacity to really make a dent, but we’re kind of seeing the need to really come around and kind of maybe fill some gaps here. Yeah, that’s about it.

# Dr. Andrea Swartzendruber

I would like to mention two things I wanted to say, too, and maybe it’s just—I really had my eye on some of the society and professional organizations that I’m a member of that every now and again have funding opportunities available, so that’s one that I continue to watch just because these people know and understand your area, they’re typically more limited, it’s not going to be everyone in the US. And so that’s one area that I’m always trying to pay attention to, the different societies and organizations who might be more open to controversial topics or new methods or that kind of thing. And then maybe the second one is just obvious but using your current research to the max, right? So you’re doing and have been funded to do something, but if you can fit in some extra questions that are related, that’s helping to create a market, some preliminary information that you can then use. So just being aware of all your opportunities, even if it’s a little bit more diverse and not totally on topic. [inaudible 37:07] survey or whatever is another opportunity.

# Audience

Can we ask questions?

# Jake Maas

Yes.

# Dr. Mandy Joye

I particularly wanted to speak to that sort of thing because I was going to mention small professional organizations, not necessarily ones you belong to, but special topics areas. We’ve been as successful as you can be I think with those kind of things which over the years has meant an odd $15,000, $20,000 there, and most recently close to $36,000 to purchase an instrument that we needed from an association of folks who were interested in dental health, [inaudible 37:47] to what we do. And that has been—they’re a professional group, but there are also groups out there, and I had a sort of experience with one of them, the kind of disease-oriented patient advocacy groups. Autism has a bunch of them and that tends to be kind of controversial because they’re fighting with each other, but there are others that, you know, diabetes patients and so forth have got patient advocacy groups and sometimes they do—I don’t know about those laterally advertised and that sort of thing, but the dental group that’s funding us does not advertise their funding but they have a funding mechanism that they use for people who approach them. And if someone were interested in something that was of interest to them, there’s a way you approach them. They have a grant review process that’s very formal. But it’s my [inaudible 38:49] is often the case, the up front thing is the white paper, which kind of gives you clear before you spend a whole lot of time on something. But it is important, yeah, certainly taking into consideration all the things that you don’t particularly [inaudible 39:03] in composing that.

# Dr. Mandy Joye (continued)

So that, I want to echo your enthusiasm for that sort of thing, and while we’re on the topic of sourcing, we’ve had some experience recently with crowdfunding, which we decided to try. Sort of just because it’s there. And there are—we worked initially, and it has to do with this instrument purchase. We got half of the money from the dental organization and we said we’d try to raise the other half of it. We raised part of that, and then we went back to the dentists and said we still need you, and they came through with the rest of it. But we tried the University of Georgia funder initially, that’s one thing that if you’re looking for, if you want to send a student out to do a mini grant proposal, it’s a good, you know, to get them oriented towards $1,000, $1,500 for a field trip, it’s a very useful, didactic thing as a mentor to make use of that. It’s not going to be big money, and I think a lot of it is often very oriented towards students more than towards research projects that I might propose. And this isn’t going to solve your problems with a big lab project, but I think that getting that [inaudible 40:21] over the years, or the dentists just giving $8,000 or $9,000, which is a typical amount that you might see from that sort of setting. The other one that we almost were going to try but we just decided we’ve got to cut and run and ask the dentists because we need to get this thing running, and so we went back to them, but there is a very well-run now and interesting science-based crowdfunding operation called Experiment, and there were, over the years, several of them whose different names, one was called Petri Plate, and one was, you know, they were not unlike Kickstarter, the early ones were just kind of like crowd Georgia funder is not a Kickstarter model, it’s a donation model. You set a goal on what you want to get, and if you don’t make it, you get whatever anybody did contribute in Georgia Funder. So it’s a donation type mechanism. And then Kickstarter is different. The Kickstarter model is you set a goal, it’s all or nothing. If you get your goal, fine. You get the money, but it’s a pledge model. So Experiment, which is the surviving crowdfunding science source operation is a Kickstarter model. We talked with them about—looked at their site, and I have a colleague at the University of Washington who was funded by them, and their strategies involved using and going that approach, it can be time and energy costly, even for $6,000. But that’s the level that Experiment says, you know, you get a couple of months to make a case, and if you don’t get it, you can get $4,500, but if you haven’t made it, you’re not going to get that money. I throw this out solely because it is out there and people do hit, and Experiment actually prides itself on announcing the papers that come out of projects that have been funded by Experiment. And it has a very distinguished board of directors. They’re very serious scientists associated with Experiment. I just wanted to pass that along, and then I wanted to ask a question, kind of of you maybe, that has to do with angel funding? Because I think that that is—I mean, I have a reasonably honorable eight figure history here at the University of Georgia over the years, and now things are getting [inaudible 43:05] I won’t even begin to tell you about how controversial what I work on is, but it is just because funding is going down right now anyway, hard to get funding. I’m looking into more of those things while still turning in R21s on a regular basis and entertaining myself with the replies. I’ve got a book full of them. But I can’t go to the NSF with what I do. Back in the day, I tell you how long I’ve been doing science, back in the day you could go to NSF with human health, which you can’t do for years now. I have colleagues who are more on the applied side that have been collaborators who have gotten angel funding, $5M kind of working on cancer and stuff like that. so I hear about these things, and I’m, you know, not, I mean, all the kinds of things you were saying about staying in touch with people that you know are interested, whoever they are is something that, yes, that’s fun to do. But to what degree does the university foster making known specific projects that are particular areas of research. How do you guys develop your clients, I guess, in terms of discovering what they might be interested in that you could match up with somebody here at the university? How does that work? I know that there’s a certain amount of competition between Georgia Funder and the Foundation, and I think that you know, I understand that, but tell me more about that.

# Matt Pruitt

Yeah, so obviously on one level, maybe something you referenced there, there’s some institutional priorities that people way above my level decide, like here is what we want to present. For instance, the priorities for our current capital campaign, those kind of things. And when we go to people, I’m going to go ahead and say this word, when we go to people like Woodruff, and [inaudible 45:06], I can’t go to Woodruff. That’s something that the president, the vice president of development, they go to Woodruff with something they decide is an institutional priority, something that’s important not just to one unit, but to the university as a whole. But my office, we most definitely, I mean, that’s the bulk of what we do is trying to figure out what is the mission and focus of these foundations, and how does that match up with research and work that people are doing here on campus, and how can we get them together? How can we get to a point where we can ask them for money for those projects?

# Dr. Mandy Joye

I’m thinking extra-foundational, I’m thinking more individual investor kind of thing, individual donor sort of person.

# Matt Pruitt

Oh yeah, so obviously if you have individual donors or we can identify them—

# Dr. Mandy Joye

That’s what I’m asking here.

# Matt Pruitt

That’s important. Yeah, so what I do a lot of times is when these requests come to me, I will send them to the folks in development who work with individuals, individuals with the kind of capacity you’re talking about who may be able to get—

# Dr. Mandy Joye

That’s a category I’m not familiar with.

# Matt Pruitt

Yeah, I’m happy to be a conduit to those people. It’s probably in some ways easier for that to happen and reach out to them directly, although they’re happy, these people, the regional directors or principal gifts people, they work with people with individuals, some alums, some not, who have capacity to give large gifts. I don’t know many in the $5M range.

# Dr. Mandy Joye

Yeah, this is just with somebody who learned about her science and really wanted to make sure it moved fast.

# Matt Pruitt

And I would say gifts like that are going to be the result of a long relationship probably. I mean, I’d be surprised.

# Dr. Mandy Joye

This one, yeah, I think that is true sometimes, it depends upon the circles in which you move, and there is a story to how this person found out about her, but she didn’t know the person before that. So there, I mean, we all have stories that we’ve heard about.

# Matt Pruitt

Yeah, that seems like a meteor striking. God bless them for that.

# Audience

I have a question for the public health researcher? What is an anonymous foundation? I mean, I understand that it’s a foundation that you can’t say the name, but [inaudible 47:26] that then became anonymous publically?

# Dr. Andrea Swartzendruber

So really the true kind of word of mouth and having colleagues. So I had a colleague who was invited to be funded by them, and then through that relationship with my colleague, I became known to them and my research got put forward to them.

# Jake Maas

Yeah, and we have some foundations that give money for research projects at UGA but remain anonymous, so it’s, depending on what they’re funding and what they want to be known, we accept anonymous, I mean, if you work in sponsored projects, you know who the foundation is, but it shows up as anonymous in all of the [inaudible 48:10].

# Audience

I have a question for the foundations, too. How important would you say is the preliminary data [inaudible 48:28] we know for NSF, NIH, you usually need to have some sort of preliminary data to apply. What about foundations?

# Matt Pruitt

Yeah, that’s the joke I’ve made with some of these foundation folks is like, so you want something that’s novel and not redundant at all with other efforts, but you want to have evidence it works, right? Those things aren’t compatible. Although I would say a lot of the ones I work with, a lot of these mid size and smaller ones, are probably a little bit more forgiving on that, and a little, I mean they’re still trying to find that sweet spot when it comes to risk/reward and return on investment, and I was talking to Jake, I mean, probably one place that my office and the kind of foundations we work with are trying to get at some of these smaller gifts for your pilot data, you know? So again, you need several million dollars to fund your research for the next three years or five years, that might not be [inaudible 49:23] but if you’re looking—I’ve got this smaller component that I want to pilot, and you need 25, 50, maybe $100,000 or whatever, then maybe, that might be something they’re more willing, if we have a good relationship with them, to say yeah, okay, there’s at least maybe some evidence it works or it’s got some—there’s a basis to think that this works, and maybe we can take a little bit more of a chance on that.

# Audience

Another question for foundation. Do you have a database that if someone has an idea for a project, can they actually come to your office, sit down, and you search the database of foundations to see who might fund such a project? Is that how it works?

Matt Pruitt

So there’s a database called the Foundation Directory Online, and we currently have a subscription to it, and I believe that you could access it if you enter it through the foundation relations website.

# Unknown speaker

Or the library’s website.

# Matt Pruitt

Or the library’s website. Foundation Directory Online, and it’s abbreviated FDO a lot of times. And they recently revamped it to I think make it less user friendly thant it was, I don’t know why they did that. but it used to be, I thought, a little easier to search in terms that made sense to real people. But yeah, you can search by subject area, geographic region, because the thing with a lot of these foundations that do have geographic limitations, they only want to fund—I mean, some of them only want to fund cities, some of them only want to fund the state.

# Audience

Also, before you apply, and I think you might have mentioned this, but I know it’s common at a lot of universities where the university says you can’t go to them because we use them for something else. Do you have a list of—or do we have to go through your office and then you’ll say, I’m sorry, you can’t use this foundation because the university wants to control what we submit?

# Matt Pruitt

Yeah, thanks for saying that, because that’s important. Our office, one function is, what we kind of consider air traffic control. More often than not, people maybe find that a foundation and Foundation Directory Online and they contact us and we may say look, we don’t really have a great relationship here, if you have a great idea and move even a contact, that happens a lot of times. Faculty say I know somebody who knows somebody who works with this foundation, so lets move forward with that, and we’ll help you all you want, or if you just want to push forward, just let us know when you submit. But there are a certain number of times too when we have to say yeah, I’m sorry, we just submitted something to them on behalf of another unit, or again, this is one that’s an institutional priority, please don’t go send anything to Woodruff or [inaudible 52:15] we’ll all get fired, so don’t do that. but yeah, we’d ask that you at least run it by us first before you go firing off [inaudible 52:24] or concept papers or anything. And we can either help—it’s pretty rare that we have to say no. Sometimes we have to say not now, maybe next grant cycle, but we hope everybody understands that’s in the best interest of all of us. One of the downfalls of being such a large university with so many moving parts is there’s a potential for these high profile foundations especially to get pinged 17 different times from the University of Georgia, and it doesn’t look good and it’s not really good for any one person who is submitting to them. So yes, please, if you find a foundation you think matches, please just contact our office and let us see where we are with them.

# Jake Maas

And just to—that the other resource that’s available is [inaudible 53:11] if anyone is not familiar with that, we have regular trainings on that, you can also just reach out to the library staff and they’ll help you set up searches where you can get a weekly e-mail for all of your research terms so you can keep abreast of anything that might be coming up that’s relevant to your research interests.

# Audience

So what you just mentioned is also true for those foundations which [inaudible 52:35], right? Like Microsoft Foundation or Amazon Foundation, or [inaudible 53:41] Foundation [inaudible 53:43].

# Matt Pruitt

Exactly, yeah. So again, my office is corporate and foundation relations. I work on the foundation side, but the people in my office work with corporations. And so for a corporate foundation, that could fall either on the corporate side or my side, but we all work together pretty closely. That’s true, yes. Before you reach out to the Georgia Power, please contact us, even if it’s a corporate foundation [inaudible 54:10].

# Dr. Andrea Swartzendruber

I have one more question for Matt as well. It seems like there’s a divide between foundations that fund research and those that fund social programs. Especially on the most kind of progressive social issues for example. You see the foundations that want to fund for example a queer organization on the ground. They want to support the work they’re doing and not so much the person who is doing research about that kind of work. So I mean, this is just like a tension that I have noticed after working with non-profits and foundations and then trying to find research funding for people with foundations. So I don’t know if this is quite as much of a binary divide as it is in my head, but do you have any kind of commentary on that, and or do you see it changing in the future, and do you think that it’s an advantage to faculty to kind of cultivate relationships with community groups or groups that are on the ground that might be more likely to get that funding?

# Matt Pruitt

I do think you’re right in that again, the kind of research that might have typically been funded by a large federal agency, a lot of foundations aren’t funding that, what I would consider like, hardcore basic research yet, but maybe we’ll see more of that as there’s recognition that that space needs to be filled. So I would say a lot of them are more maybe centered on social justice or the social component of it, but at the end of the day I would say most of them are looking for results. And some project that has a clear beginning and a clear end and we need to have an idea of what the results are going to be and we can measure those in some way. So I think a lot of them are receptive to whatever that project is that may get results. But I would say there’s maybe a hesitancy to fund some of it, the kind of research that’s traditionally been funded by the federal agencies. As far as your question about joining hands with other groups, I think that’s almost always beneficial. I’ve had a couple foundation folks say we’ve seen a little too much collaboration for collaboration’s sake, right? People know that collaboration [inaudible 56:31] and so we’re just going to try to join up with as many people as we can. But if there is some sort of additive value to the collaboration that really makes the project better, so maybe it combines some sort of component of our basic research, when it’s something that’s implemented on a social scale, then I think that’s going to be more marketable to another [inaudible 56:58].

# Audience

Following that idea, in the past it was very kind of common going for contracts and stuff like that, particularly [inaudible 57:06] international projects, but Georgia was kind of a leading environment, that university working in Africa, South America, southeast Asia. Will you comment more on that particular aspect? How to cope with possibly getting funding for applied research if you will?

# Matt Pruitt

Hmm. I bet there’s probably some panelists who may have a better answer or experience with that. but again, I would say there’s a lot of variables in play there, ranging from, again, the size of the group that we may work with [inaudible 57:44] their area of focus. There is one small foundation that I work with, it’s in Rockdale County, and one of their primary focuses is work in Africa, where they do education and public health in Africa. And I’ll just always come back to it’s kind of making sure that whatever the work is that you want to do matches up with their priorities and their mission as closely as possible at getting some results. But maybe, there’s probably people who can speak to that a little better than I can.

# Dr. Mandy Joye

I think there’s some foundations like the Gates Foundation [inaudible 58:18] Foundation that do more, or the Gates Foundation does a lot of public health. [inaudible 58:25] does a lot of—they do a lot of stuff [inaudible 58:29] technology [inaudible 58:32]. Other foundations tend to be more not so much applied, there are definitely foundations that do more applied. I think Gates is the one that sort of in my mind is way more applied public health impact.

# Audience

I also have this other question in relation to what you introduced as [inaudible 58:57] center, and I think that is becoming kind of the tendency now, [inaudible 59:02] funding from NSF, through the [inaudible 59:07]. I don’t know if you have heard about [inaudible 59:10] which is a consortium of funder agencies from different countries that are emphasizing on [inaudible 59:16] research. And so they view this as a condition for the grant, that it could incorporate different disciplines, that is not [inaudible 59:25]. So maybe you have some wisdom to share on that? Is there other sources?

# Dr. Jo Walther

Not in particular, but there is a trend I think in the funding [inaudible 59:42] that recognizes that some of the significant problems are happening in more of those [inaudible 59:48] spaces [inaudible 59:51] in different places I couldn’t offer systematic sort of advice or [inaudible 59:56]. So I think it’s going to come more and more [inaudible 1:00:04].

# Audience

I have a question. So how do you think foundations will [inaudible 1:00:12] science versus something which is very controversial [inaudible 1:00:20]. So let’s put it another way, a topic which is in the news right now.

# Dr. Mandy Joye

So my experience is that the wilder the idea, the more likely the foundation is going to fund it. I mean, I don’t know about all of you, but in my field, NSF has gotten a lot more conservative in terms of what they’re willing to risk in terms of the [inaudible 1:00:43] to do. They want to be sure that it’s going to generate discovery, but they want it to generate discovery. They don’t want it to fail. And foundations like the Water Foundation, I mean I have a really good colleague that just got funded [inaudible 1:00:59]. And she got funded because what she does is wild. It’s out there, far, far. It’s funded mostly by NASA because it’s so out there. And she got funded by more because more and more it’s always [inaudible 1:01:14] why wasn’t anybody [inaudible 1:01:17] failing? Everybody they funded published papers and was happy and doing well. And he’s like [inaudible 1:01:23] is doing something outlandish. I want somebody that’s got [inaudible 1:01:26] for failure, so they funded my friend [inaudible 1:01:28]. But I think, you know, it’s a good point. There’s got to be somebody that’s willing to take those risks, because those big risks could always lead to a huge discovery. And just transformative [inaudible 1:01:44]. There aren’t many people like [inaudible 1:01:48] out there. In terms of my personal experience with more—I’ve been criticized for not going far enough, not reaching far enough, not being as, you know, you’re not trained to do that with NSF. That would never fly with NSF. People would say I was nuts for proposing that, but I think they want you to do that, and I get the feeling that [inaudible 1:02:11] is done the same way. I mean, they want a system that’s trackable, but they want you to really think about [inaudible 1:02:20] is that you might not be able to think about with an NSF proposal. And these big foundations like Moore and Simons, you know, $5M or $10M for them is nothing. They don’t think twice about it. They don’t blink. So you can really put together an amazing transdisciplary team to do cutting edge work and really let your imagination go wild. I think that’s what they’re looking for. I think maybe a comment, and I’m having a senior moment, so I can’t think of the name of the book, but if you want I can go back to my desk and send it to you. It’s about creativity and that they’ve done research on it, and it’s just like you got into your point that everybody says they love creativity and they want innovation, but when it comes down to making a decision what they want is to be successful. They don’t want it to fail. And even if it doesn’t move the needle at all, or if it’s going in the wrong direction, people would rather do that than to say it didn’t work. And even though you know, those of you or those of us who might be writing for very creative projects, when we become the decision maker, you have to go with a very conservative mindset. So I think that’s very true and there’s research to support that. And I don’t know if you use that when you’re writing proposals to get around that psychology. But what I try to do, it’s off the wall, but I think it sort of works is that, when I write proposals, I refuse to make them so incredibly boring and doable that nobody is, the reviewers are going to be like okay, well, duh. I don’t want that to happen, so I provide a menu of absolutely we can do this, and if we’re lucky we can do this, and if we’re really lucky, oh my gosh, we can do this. And when you set it up so that you’ve got absolutely guaranteed deliverables, a list of probable deliverables, and then an oh my gosh if we pull this off it will change the way we think about X. Then you’re almost guaranteeing yourself success because the proposal manager sees you’re thinking outside the box, you’re also being responsible and conservative, you’re going to provide them something for the money for the money they’re giving you. It may not be that, you know, [inaudible 1:04:38] is cited 10,000 times, but at least something. I don’t think we can afford to be super [inaudible 1:04:45] I just, as much as [inaudible 1:04:48] tell me that I need to not put that third tier in there, I put it in there anyway, because the reviewers like it, they like that you’re thinking that way, they like that you’re sort of not limiting your imagination. Because I think that the way funding works is really styming that creativity impulse that you have. I’ve had students say oh, I don’t want to do that because the experiment is too risky. And I’m like, you’re absolutely [inaudible 1:05:11] experiment. I don’t care if you fail 100 times. On the 101st time its going to work and you’re going to get this amazing paper out of it, and don’t be afraid of failing. I think we’re sort of as a culture out of this place where failure is just, you know, shunned and looked down upon and how do you learn if you don’t fail? I haven’t learned anything from being successful. What I learn from is failing. Fail better is one of the best points ever. Yeah, you don’t know [inaudible 1:05:42] Google it because it’s on my wall and it should be on everybody’s wall.

# Jake Maas

Other questions or comments or—

# Dr. Andrea Swartzendruber

Just a comment on Mandy’s comment, I used to have a poster that said, in this house, we do all these things. They’re quotes from Star Wars. Truly great poster. And one of them had, I’d have to look up and see which movie it’s from, but it’s, you all remember “Do or not do, there is no try” kind of thing. It’s one of those sort of things. I can’t remember exactly what it is, but it’s kind of like we’re just a bunch of geeks here and don’t want to know about the odds. If you look at the odds, they’re awful. And you can’t write from that perspective.

# Audience

Jacob, I know a couple of people here, but I would love to just maybe go around and introduce ourselves by our department, and maybe, I don’t know, a sentence on our research. I’m really curious about it. Sure, I’m kind of [inaudible 1:07:05] I’m an assistant professor in the department of education, [inaudible 1:07:13], mathematics education in particular. So I was on an NSF revitalize panel, and I guess academia is so, like you move on despite getting told so many times your ideas aren’t good enough or whatever, right? Like this is the business of how many times can you get bitten and get back up again? And so like, I’m on this panel and I think we’re only going to move two proposals forward and it just ends up being the people who have been funded time and time again, even if they’re using instruments, in this one case, that have not been shown to be particularly helpful in changing or improving education or student outcomes. So for an assistant professor that doesn’t have this sort of previous experience, it’s hard to know how to pitch, and who to pitch to. So I’m wondering if you could even speak a little bit to like, like I know you’re talking about developing these relationships when you’re writing your proposal like, who are you thinking of pitching to? And then in my case, in particular, when I don’t have like, look at these millions of dollars I’ve already had and all of the stuff that’s coming out of all the publications I’ve had coming out of these millions of dollars. How should I think about—what would your guy’s [inaudible 1:08:41].

# Dr. Mandy Joye

When I was an assistant professor [inaudible 1:08:50]. I was much younger than I am now. I think that what I tried to do was to pitch my proposals to maybe the top 20 people in the field. So I knew what—I read all their papers, I tried to get inside their heads whenever I watched them give talks. Because those were the people that are very likely just a couple of them are going to review your proposal. So you need to be aware of if they have any particular dislikes, you need to not go there and hit the things that they like. You can look at the funding history of the program. It sounds like you’ve already done that, but looking, reading the abstracts and proposals and information and publications [inaudible 1:09:38] but I think really, when you’re building your reputation early on in your career, it’s really important that you recognize the playing field, so that’s all about the people who are going to be peer reviewing your proposal. And being aware, I mean, there are some real jerks out there. Figure out who they are and put them down in your list of who to not send my proposal to Mr. [inaudible 1:10:05] or whatever. My favorite is just you know, who has a vested interest on that.

# Dr. Andrea Swartzendruber

Just to [inaudible 1:10:13] on that is with the names of the people who are on the panel.

# Dr. Mandy Joye

What do you mean?

# Dr. Andrea Swartzendruber

I mean, you know, the names of the people who are on the various panels that your proposal is going to are published, and you may not get those people, but a good number of them will be in the room. So knowing their buzzwords [inaudible 1:10:37] is the same sort of thing that Mandy is talking about.

# Dr. Mandy Joye

I mean, even though I’m in a different discipline, what you’re describing sounds completely familiar, and many conversations that I’ve had among my colleagues as well, and a number of my colleagues have invited the senior person, invited the most well known person to be a part of their grant and lo and behold, it’s funded. But I would say too that there’s been some pretty awful kind of experiences that have come out of that too, like don’t invite the jerk. You don’t want to be [inaudible 1:11:10], you don’t want it to be seen like oh it’s really that person’s project, and so it’s attention, but people who’ve been funded get funded. So how, when you don’t have that funding history, it’s very hard to break into, particularly given this climate when [inaudible 1:11:28] everybody talks about new initiatives and new [inaudible 1:11:30] people and to bring up new people, but the truth is, it is completely hard, and the people that I know who have gotten lots of funding have often invited them as senior people to be a part of their projects, it’s not the other way, you know?

# Dr. Andrea Swartzendruber

Or even get invited for a seminar. I mean, if there are people you want to get to know and you haven’t had time to meet them at the meeting, get them to come give a seminar. People do that.

# Audience

[inaudible 1:12:02] junior assistant professor, [inaudible 1:12:06] make sure you read the proposals of senior professors because [inaudible 1:12:09]. And after five or 10 years, learning all that [inaudible 1:12:16] it’s time for the junior professors and your proposals. That has always been my experience as an assistant professor from the last four years. So when I came here as an assistant professor, and still as an assistant professor, technically, but I started writing my own proposals. [inaudible 1:12:33] senior professor, he just retired actually. He was [inaudible 1:12:42] professor in my school. [inaudible 1:12:36] you need to be [inaudible 1:12:53] and then they will fund it, and you will get money, and use that money to [inaudible 1:12:58] for the next five to 10 years, and then you [inaudible 1:13:02] and I [inaudible 1:13:06] money is not a problem. [inaudible 1:13:13] everything [inaudible 1:13:25].

# Dr. Andrea Swartzendruber

I’m going to just speak to a theme that I heard from a professor who couldn’t be here today who gets a lot of foundation funding and also makes a lot of those connections herself. So she travels constantly, but she told me, I asked her, so where are you meeting these people? Where are you meeting program officers? Is it at public interest conferences where there are lots of advocates and people on the ground in your field? Is it academic conferences? And she said it’s actually these kind of state, international, where people are trying to talk about the regulatory frameworks for the issue that she works on and that’s where their program officers from foundations for some reason. So I don’t have some great advice about it, but it seems like she’s going to these really broad range of conferences, the key being outside of academia, and she’s also sort of slowly finding out where foundation reps are showing up and going to those spaces and kind of doing what you’re talking a based on, Mandy, just engaging them, capturing them in person, making the face-to-face contact.

# Audience

Along the same lines, my wife was at the University of Alabama, and they used the university [inaudible 1:14:37]. You put your proposal—which program officer you want to go see, and twice a month they load up the university professors, they drive to Washington or wherever, they all get out, get in Ubers, and they go to meet the program officers. So they get the whole thing. And then they do that a couple of times. You know, I’m sure we have several [inaudible 1:15:00]. But I mean, they do have, I mean, she’s an English professor and she was allowed to go, and as a result she did get an NEA grant based on that relationship she made [inaudible 1:15:16] and that was the very first grant she had ever written.

# Jake Maas

Let’s keep introducing ourselves.

# Audience

Hi everybody, I’m Jackie Hartberger, and I’m an assistant professor at Hugh Hodgeson School of Music. I’m a conductor, so I guess my research is actually the public medium of live art performance, and what we’re experiencing in the music school is a severe deficit of people actually attending concerts. So my goal is to try and figure out what [inaudible 1:15:51], especially for UGA but also as a national [inaudible 1:15:54] because you don’t have this problem over in Europe. Everybody goes to concerts and participates in lessons. But here, people don’t do that, and we also are battling the issue of being able to stream concerts [inaudible 1:16:08] I’m thinking more people enjoy watching concerts in their pajamas. So that’s kind of what I’m trying to get out of [inaudible 1:16:15] because really I’m not a researcher. My job is interacting with people. But trying to figure out how to access these funds to start promoting a new future for live music. Especially helping our music school grow, for our students’ futures. Any ideas? I don’t know, that might [inaudible 1:16:38].

# Dr. Mandy Joye

Well I’ve just got to ask, I mean, live music is a big thing in Athens. It’s pop music, but there’s really that disparity with the [inaudible 1:16:49]. It’s a shame.

# Audience

**It is a shame, and I just don’t know how to, well, I have ideas. But it’s also the idea of the large [inaudible 1:17:01] I think the solution has been to go to smaller ensembles to do chamber settings. But there’s still that disconnect between the music and the people and the patron essentially. So it’s finding that.**

# Dr. Mandy Joye

Somebody in the [inaudible 1:17:18].

# Jake Maas

Where’s that at?

# Audience

Here.

# Jake Maas

Here in?

# Audience

There’s a program in music business that [inaudible 1:17:25].

# Jake Maas

You can shamelessly plug your concert.

**[Laughter]**

# Audience

Free and open to the public, and it’s on Friday, April 20th. Easy to remember, 4/20. [Inaudible 1:17:41] it’s at 8:00.

# Jake Maas

What’s the venue?

# Audience

Right here in Hodgson, so in our performing arts center [inaudible 1:17:50]. It will be a fun concert, but the last piece involves electronics, like the whole idea is what would it be like if we performed music underwater. So the piece is called [inaudible 1:18:00] Waters and it’s really neat. It’s quite fascinating and hopefully user friendly to the audience to listen to. If you want something to do, it’s fun, and the concert shouldn’t last longer than an hour. 8:00.

I’m Julianne Schmidt, I’m in the department of kinesiology. I am from California, so I got your reference. I also relate to something that you said, getting hit and getting back up again, because literally what I study, I study concussions, and the reason this session piqued my interest is because I really face two problems in that world: I’m looking at [inaudible 1:18:37] concussion, and in the concussion world, we focus a lot on sport, and we’re very tunnel vision on sport. And so a lot of our proposals don’t appeal to NIH because it’s not really a public health concern. It’s only relevant to athletes. But the driving area does, but it’s so outside of the norm of the concussion world that there’s not a lot of ties over between funding mechanisms. So a lot of the work I’ve done has been funded by organizations like the NCAA, which has been really good but they’re not really interested in funding this other area that I’m really, really interested in and really trying to plant my flag in as really the only person doing research in that area. So that was my big interest. The other thing is concussion is a hot topic so there are [inaudible 1:19:29] and I’ve kind of gotten sucked into this habit of like, selling my soul to the RFP and like, oh I can do, I pretty much know who wrote the RFP and I can basically recreate the study they’re asking me to, you know? But then it doesn’t get funded, and even if it did get funded, it probably wouldn’t be really what I wanted to do anyway. So I struggled with that, like whether to go for the funding [inaudible 1:20:00] are clearly looking to [inaudible 1:20:02] concussion work and sell my soul a little bit to that, or to stick to more open ended submissions.

# Jake Maas

Plus your work is probably going to [inaudible 1:20:15] people on the head and then put into cars and tell them to drive around the world.

# Audience

Yeah, we do do that. That’s why we have that circle around Ramsey where we just—

# Jake Maas

We’re just about out of time, so I need to let our panelists go. But anyone who—we have this room until 2:00 so if anybody wants to interact and talk about their research and network a little bit is welcome to do that. but I’d like to thank all of our panelists for molding this inchoate topic into something comprehensible and interesting. At least I thought it was comprehensible and interesting. And so—

[Applause]

# Jake Maas

[Inaudible 1:21:03]. Feel free to contact us and propose [inaudible 1:21:10].