Chapter 11
From a Single Work to Multiple Scholarly Spin-Offs

Abstract Scholarly productivity depends upon making good choices about which projects to pursue; this is how this chapter begins. One common question from graduate students and college/university faculty members is how to produce multiple publications from the same basic body of work. This chapter provides direction on "working smarter" without succumbing to self-plagiarism. Although doctoral students and university faculty typically are involved in many different types of grants and projects; they may not know how to move beyond those experiences to share them successfully with a wider audience. This chapter supports readers in planning a manuscript that follows the structure best suited for descriptions of projects and grants, namely: Needs Assessment, Design/Planning, Implementation, and Outcomes/Evaluation. Readers are advised to use logic models for program evaluation as a way to enhance success with grants and projects.

While hosting two visiting researchers from Japan, I asked if there was anything in particular that they would like to do now that their interviews and site visits were over. One of the professors had attended Columbia University in New York and said, "We want to go to a big, United States grocery store" and I obliged. As we walked through the store, one of them said, "We are not familiar with this word, B-O-G-O. What does it mean?" "Oh," I said, "it is an acronym that means buy one, get one—the second one is free." They looked at each other, smiled, and she replied, "We like this idea very much." The prospect of a BOGO in writing is equally attractive to authors. Strategies for getting more than one project from the same basic literature review is what this chapter is all about. We included grants here because they are a type of writing that often is rewarded at postsecondary institutions yet their potential for publication is not necessarily realized (Naish, 2013).

The chapter begins with a discussion of scholarly productivity and components that are commonly used to evaluate faculty. It then moves into ways to identify projects with high potential for generating various types of work products that help authors to attain their goals. Next, it addresses grant proposals as a writing task. The chapter concludes with guidelines on what is acceptable—or not—where "spin-offs" in academic endeavors are concerned.

The Concept of Scholarly Productivity

A leading professor from a major research university once remarked, "Of all the things you might do at the university, earning the esteem of your colleagues is one of the most important." To that end, Lucas and Murry (2011) advise new faculty to become good university citizens. Faculty members who have achieved (and deserve) sterling reputations as teachers, advisors, mentors, colleagues, scholars, leaders, and community members generally are good university citizens. They show up. They get work done and turn it in on time. They continue to contribute to the department, university, community and their professions, even in the absence of tangible rewards. They act on their commitment to continuous improvement in the courses they teach, the programs they direct, and the groups with whom they affiliate from local to international. They resist the temptation to exploit the less powerful by deluging newcomers with committee work or gathering up all the glory for themselves when a project turns out to be successful. Being a productive scholar surely consists of more than an impressive CV and shameless self-promotion (Boyer, Moser, Ream, & Braxton, 2015). Nevertheless, while comprehensive evaluation nearly always emphasizes the three areas of teaching, research, and service, priority definitely is given to productivity as a scholar, particularly after professors gain a few years of experience. In fact, Nygaard (2016, in press) narrowly defines scholarly productivity as how much peer-reviewed output is published by faculty.

Most institutions of higher education have specific criteria for assessing scholarly work yet, as anyone who has served on a university-wide evaluation committee can attest, weighing the relative merits of faculty members' work across disciplines is a challenge. Over the years, there have been many different methods proposed for making these judgments (Centra, 1993; Seldin, 1984). Four areas that are commonly assessed to determine scholarly productivity and are part of the Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index (FSPI) developed by Martin and Olejnizak are in Fig. 11.1 (see http://www.america.edu/the_faculty_scholarly_productivity_index_ (fspi).html for more details).

One way to monitor your progress toward such goals is to use a grid such as the one in Table 11.1; it was adapted from a matrix used by University of California and gives a sense of what goes into faculty members' professional portfolios.

Activity 11.1: Charting a Course for Scholarly Productivity
Using the categories in Table 11.1, assess your areas of strength and areas that need improvement. What steps can you take to address the blank spaces in the table so that you can present a well-balanced professional portfolio?

Fig. 11.1 Four dimensions of scholarly productivity

Assessing the Creative Potential in Projects

In Academia, creative thinking is a key to job satisfaction because resourcefulness and originality in scholarly work are prized across departments and colleges. When doctoral students hear that they are expected to make an original contribution to the field through a dissertation, they sometimes think this means a revolutionary, paradigm-shifting, never before imagined giant stride forward. Yet most of the time, creativity consists of developing something new from available and stored information. Creative thinkers connect the seemingly unconnected, recombine ideas into something new, see things afresh, juxtapose concepts in surprising ways, and notice things that others tend to overlook. This type of thought is particularly prized in scholarly endeavors that shape the professions they represent. Therefore, when scholars do generate something original that is valued by fellow experts, it contributes to their sense not only of doing well but of being well. As you manage your life and work, overall well-being is an important consideration. The father of positive psychology movement, Martin Seligman (2012), posits that well-being is what enables us, not merely to survive but to thrive. He regards our capacity to flourish as

Table 11.1 Example of a tabular report of scholarly activity

Date:
Name:
Rank:
Date of First Appointment:
Purpose of Evaluation:

CATEGORY 1: EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND FULLMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

TEACHING LOADS AND EVALUATION SUMMARIES

STUDENT EVALUATION RATINGS

Term Semester and Year	Course No.	# Enrolled	# Responding	% Superior	% Above Average	% Average	% Below Average

OR Alternative Work Assignments (e.g., supervision of interns, administrative assignments)

PEER AND CHAIRPERSON EVALUATIONS

Required Observations	Semester/year	Course number	Quotation from Observation report
Chairperson			
Peer Observation			

ADVISING

Type of Advisement	Site of Advisement	Number of Students and Responsibilities

A.   INSTRUCTIONALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES (EVIDENCE FILE #IE)

Program	Type of Development	Role and Level of Involvement

COURSE SYLLABI

Course number and Title	Program	Meets University Criteria for Syllabus Preparation?

CATEGORY I COMMENTS:

Table 11.1 (continued)

CATEGORY II:CONTINUING SCHOLARLY GROWTH

PUBLICATIONS (ALL ARTICLES, CHAPTERS IN BOOKS, BOOKS, MONOGRAPHS, ONLINE PUBLICATIONS). (EVIDENCE FILE #IIA)

Number (most recent first)	Complete Citation	Status (i.e., in print, in press, accepted)	Peer Reviewed?	Acceptance Rate?
1.				
2.				
3.				

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

Title and Amount Requested	Research, Training, or Other?	Funding Source?	Funded?	Amount Received and Date

OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (e.g., new program development) (EVIDENCE FILE #IIC)

Date	Title	Role

EDITING/REVIEWING

Date	Journal or Book Title	Role

COMPETITIVE/INVITED PAPERS PRESENTED AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

Number (most recent first)	International, National, Regional, State or local?	Title of Presentation	Conference/ Organization	Location	Date Presented? Date Accepted?	Proceedings Published?
1.						
2.						

CATEGORY II COMMENTS:

Table 11.1 (continued)

CATEGORY III: SERVICE: CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PROFESSION, UNIVERSITY AND/OR COMMUNITY

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Type	Organization	Role/length of service	Accomplishments
International			
National			
State			
Local			

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

Type	Group	Role	Accomplishments
University-wide			
College-Wide			
Department			

COMMUNITY SERVICE/ACTIVITIES

Type	Group	Role/length of service	Accomplishments
International			
National			
Regional			
State			
Local			

HONORS

Type	Organization	Teaching, research or service award?
International		
National		
Regional		
State		
Local		

D. OTHER

CATEGORY III. COMMENTS:

being shaped by five forces: positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning, and accomplishment—all represented by the acronym PERMA. With this orientation in mind, we offer ten questions to guide you in choosing projects. Productive faculty members will tell you that they have too many projects going on and that they need to learn to say no more often. So, use Table 11.2 to do some thinking about how to be more selective about the projects you agree to undertake.

In the field of cognitive therapy, there is a phenomenon referred to as "cognitive distortions"—exaggerated, illogical thinking that people often resort to in times of stress (Beck, 2011). Cognitive distortions can run rampant where scholarly productivity is concerned because people may feel that: others are brilliant, their

Table 11.2 Ten questions to ask about projects

1. *Will I learn something new and valuable*? If the activity does not stretch your thinking and prompt you to work at the edge of your competence, it may not meet the criteria for professional development. Originality and innovation are a defining characteristic of excellent work across the disciplines (Shiu, 2014)
2. *What are my unique contributions*? If others engaged in the task can accomplish everything without your input, it may not be the best investment of your time. Collaboration is the predominant way of generating innovative ideas (Bozeman & Boardman, 2014) and a boon to entrepreneurship (Bozeman, Fay, & Slade, 2013)
3. *Is it a good match for my skills*? If a task is easy, it becomes boring; if it is too difficult, it gets frustrating (Csikzentmihalyi, 2008). You need not be the leading expert in the field in order to launch a project. You should, however, be highly motivated to acquire the skills that you need and collaborate with capable others to shore up any deficiencies
4. *Does the activity consistently rise to the top of my list*? If a project is compelling, you will treat it as a priority; if you avoid it or make excuses for not completing the related tasks, your level of engagement is low and this may not be a good match for your strengths and interests (Shernoff, 2013)
5. *Is the project full of potential*? If an activity has truly captivated you then you should find it easy to imagine many different directions and possibilities. Fluency of this type is part of the creative process (Csikzentmihalyi, 2013)
6. *Am I impelled to pursue the endeavor*? If a project is enthralling, you would do the work, even in the absence of tangible rewards. Intrinsic motivation is a key characteristic of creative endeavors (Runco, 2014)
7. *Is your level of commitment strong*? Initial enthusiasm may launch a project but you need to consider if your commitment is sufficient to propel the project forward and sustain the effort through to completion. The best projects absorb thoughts, feelings, and actions
8. *Are you self-directed in monitoring progress and attaining goals*? According to attribution theory, those who credit their success to hard work and determination are more likely to have leadership qualities (Martinko, Harvey, & Douglas, 2007). They are not overly dependent upon others for praise nor for hand-holding. As you evaluate the potential of projects, move toward greater self-direction
9. *Is the project a favorite conversational topic*? The most promising projects consume us, in a good way. They dominate our thinking even beyond academic circles and we are eager to talk about the activity. This interest also extends to patience with educating others about what we are doing—and why
10. *Are you so absorbed that you lose track of time*? If a project is captivating, you won't resent the time it takes; in fact, you may find that the time flies by when working on it because it is an "optimal experience" (Csikzentmihalyi, 2008)

skills are inadequate, the pressure to achieve is oppressive, the chances of success are slim, and—even if they are successful—it was attributable to fate. Thus, it is useful to examine how they might erode confidence, motivation, resilience, and persistence in academic writing tasks (Table 11.3).

Activity 11.2: Tackling Cognitive Distortions

Did you recognize any of the cognitive distortions in Table 11.3 in yourself and others? What can you do as a professional, as a colleague and/or as a mentor to minimize these negative influences?

Table 11.3 Cognitive distortions: counteracting negative thinking

Cognitive distortion	Explanation	Example	Alternative
All-or-nothing thinking and overgeneralizations	Neglecting to see the gray areas and drawing sweeping conclusions	"Even though the decision was 'revise and resubmit', I think that the reviews were terrible. I may as well give up; it's never going to get published"	"If I address each and every one of these recommend-dations, I have a good shot at publication"
Blaming	Identifying a culprit	"That editor just does not appreciate the problems of authors writing in English as a second language"	"It is my responsibility to use all available resources to make my writing error-free and readable. I'm going to ask some native speakers to review the manuscript before I submit"
Discounting the positive	Attributing success to external forces rather than good thinking and diligence	"I'm just lucky, I guess, to get a place on the national conference program"	"I worked really hard on my conference proposal and it earned acceptance as a result of that effort"
Mental filter	Being overly optimistic (or pessimistic)	"If I give this dissertation chapter to my committee even though it is a very rough draft, they can save me time by telling me how to fix it"	"I'm going to wait until this chapter is as polished and professional as I can make it before sharing it with the committee. That is the surest way for them to continue to have confidence in me"
Jumping to conclusions making (negative) predictions	Thinking that it is possible to foresee the outcomes	"We probably won't get the grant because the competition is so keen. Then I will have wasted all of that time without anything to add to my CV"	"If we don't get funded by this group, we'll try another source. I can use material from the grant to teach a class, in a conference presentation, or a practical article"

Should statements	"At this stage in my career, I should be able to get a book contract, no problem"	"I'm going to turn the process of learning to write a book proposal into a professional development project. There are trusted colleagues I can ask, funded proposals to use as examples, books I can read, and conference sessions I can attend to improve my chances of success"
Magnification/catastrophizing	"If I don't get this university-wide award, everyone will be talking about my failure. I will be humiliated and disgraced"	"There is honor in the nomination. If I don't get the award, I'm sure that someone else deserving will. At least it was a vote of confidence from my colleagues"
Taking it personally	"When I wasn't awarded the book contract on the first try, I was so hurt. I probably won't try with that publishing house again; I don't think that the editor likes me"	"Now I have revised my book proposal in response to the reviewers' critiques. They thought of things that I did not and made some good suggestions. Now it is a much stronger prospectus"
Negative comparisons	"So much of what is published is garbage. Why was I singled out for rejection? Can't they just accept it?"	"It's undeniably tough to get published in a top-tier journal. I may need to try a less competitive outlet first and build up to the more impressive outlets"

Maximizing Scholarly Output

One common question from graduate students and college/university faculty members is how to produce multiple publications from a body of work. The concept here is not to repeat the same work; rather, it is to show how, by changing the focus, audience, and purpose it is possible to produce different publications grounded in the same basic literature review. First, set expectations realistically by considering these points:

- For students, there are academic integrity policies that prohibit the use of the same basic paper to fulfill assignments from two different courses.
- For faculty members, savvy tenure/promotion/evaluation committees will investigate just how similar two publications are; duplicates will not be counted as a separate publication.
- It may seem as though generating two manuscripts on the same topic would be easy, but it seldom is. Although you will save time conducting a literature review, it becomes a new writing task when you change the audience, focus, and outlet.

Nevertheless, there is much to be said for "spin offs" from previous scholarly endeavors. Some advantages of building on previous work include:

- *Developing greater depth and breadth of understanding*. When you delve into the same intellectual terrain repeatedly, this offers the best chance of a thorough knowledge about a topic, issue, trend, or professional practice.
- *Making the process more efficient*. Instead of beginning at step one, prior work invested on a project can accelerate a subsequent, related project. Rather than conducting an entirely new literature review, for instance, you may be able to do just an update or a related literature review focused on a particular facet.
- *Increasing visibility*. If a fellow scholar searches a topic and finds your work repeatedly, this helps to establish a reputation as a leader in the field.
- *Seeing new possibilities*. Each success tends to build confidence and motivation to pursue other avenues for disseminating the work to different audiences for different purposes.

To illustrate how spin-offs can operate, I conducted review of the literature on faculty members' scholarly productivity to secure a faculty professional development grant that was funded by the Provost. He recommended that I write a short newsletter article about the project for higher education administrators that was published. After that, I wrote a journal article that was published in *The Educational Forum* (Jalongo, 1985). Then, while browsing through the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, I learned about a "Best Essay Award" through the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), submitted the manuscript and it was selected for a national award. This gave me an all-expense-paid trip to the conference, a lovely dinner at the Palmer House in Chicago, and a spot on the conference program. Using the same basic literature review as the foundation, five different scholarly goals were accomplished and none of it was self-plagiarized. Each was a related yet separate task.

One way to enhance creativity is to consider both transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary strategies. Transdisciplinary refers to distinctive work products; for example, a training for practitioners, a research paper presented at a conference, and a grant proposal. Interdisciplinary perspectives extend the concept beyond a domain of study. When work is interdisciplinary, it helps to foster "out of the box" thinking and build capacity for innovation (Lyall & Meagher, 2012). This occurs in at least three different ways. First, interdisciplinarity transcends the "silo" effect in organizations that keep people walled off from one another; second, it prompts people to look beyond narrow areas of specialization; and third, it counteracts the parochialism of being immersed in the local context only. All of this nudges faculty members to step outside their comfort zones and puts them in the position of needing to figure things out. Chances are, this is going to lead to more original and interesting outcomes.

A personal/professional experience helps to explain how the transdisciplinary/interdisciplinary dynamic works.

My doctorate is in curriculum and instruction. In recent years, *I have written about humane education* (Jalongo 2013b) *and conducted some research on the effects of the human-animal bond* (Levinson et al., 2016). *Most of my community service activity has focused on advocacy for children and animals. Many years ago*, *I became fascinated by the concept of dog training in correctional facilities. It all began with a short-lived television program called Cell Dogs. Each episode featured a project in which carefully selected inmates became expert dog trainers. Some programs worked with local shelters to make homeless dogs more adoptable by teaching them basic obedience*, *others prepared service dogs trained to perform useful tasks for people with disabilities*, *and so forth. The potential of such programs to make a contribution to the community and equip inmates with reentry skills captured my imagination. In 2001*, *a large, high-tech, maximum security correctional facility was built a short distance from my home. A prison dog training program idea continued to percolate but I knew almost nothing about the prison setting or which staff member to contact. During a one-semester sabbatical leave*, *I decided to start talking about the idea and contacting people. I discovered that one of my colleagues has a spouse who teaches classes at the prison, so I wrote a proposal*, *he graciously reviewed it*, *and delivered it to the right person. Shortly afterwards*, *I received a telephone call. To my surprise*, *several employees had been working*, *behind the scenes*, *on a service dog training program over the preceding year. According to the American Disabilities Act*, *a service dog is an individually trained dog that performs tasks to mitigate a person's disability. So*, *if a person is confined to a wheelchair*, *a service dog would such things as operating light switches, opening doors, and retrieving dropped objects. The program developers had chosen to collaborate with a group that had nearly 50 years of experience*, *United Disabilities Services Foundation* (www.udsf.org). *In their highly respected Service Dogs program*, *the dogs need to master 80 different commands in order to help a person with a disability. The training takes about two years*, *the client with the disability is required to attend classes to learn how to work with the dog*, *and the person/dog team is evaluated annually. To their credit*, *the prison instructors had*

first learned to be dog trainers themselves; now they would teach this skill set to inmates with support from UDSF. They also had modified the physical environment so that inmates selected to participate in the program were housed in cell block together and had access to an outdoor space for the dogs. The part of my proposal that they liked the most was the curriculum and instruction. Using the resources of leading professional organizations and local experts, I would design four, noncredit courses that would be offered through the community studies division of the university. Successful training of a dog, completion of the coursework, and the recommendation of the instructors would result in a certificate of dog training. The staff also needed opportunities to have the dogs experience a wide variety of situations that they would not encounter in a prison setting, so I used my connections with schools and in the community to support this. This project illustrates both transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches. Some different modalities within the project—the transdisciplinary applications—were: written proposals to the prison and continuing education at the university, PowerPoint/photo essays to educate adults and children about service dogs and the project; and course syllabi, handouts, online resources, tests, and portfolio guidelines for the four courses.

When professors hear about the program, they say, "Oh, that's criminology". Actually, it isn't. The prison staff have degrees in criminology and in-depth knowledge of the local facility; UDSF has service dog training expertise. My contribution is developing the curriculum and teaching humane education concepts. This project called upon me to be a "boundary spanner" as I: contacted national and state organizations to get the latest information, worked with community leaders to review course content (e.g., animal advocacy groups, veterinarians) to ensure that course content was accurate; conducted a review of the literature on dog training programs in correctional facilities; collaborated on grant proposals; taught specific lessons to the inmates, and made presentations to groups (e.g., at the public library, in college classes, to kennel clubs and professional dog training groups, to service organizations). The first group of dogs was so successful that the program has expanded to two additional correctional facilities; they regard these programs as important reentry tools for inmates. When we read the inmates' dog training journals and the letters they wrote to the people who now own the dogs that they trained, their sincerity touched our hearts. After the placement of the dogs was made, it inspired all of us to do more and try harder. One dog is changing the life of a military veteran with physical and psychological wounds. Still another is helping a child with Autism Spectrum Disorder; the list goes on. As more people benefit and data are gathered, new possibilities emerge for presentations, publications, and grants. With my capable partners in this venture, what was once just a dream is an uplifting reality for staff, inmates, clients, and community.

Many times, our dream projects remain a secret—at least for a time. Even though they seem far out of reach, a passion for the project continues to burn. Over the years, I have learned to "blue sky it" and spend some time imagining what might be possible when some of the conditions fall into place. As with any invitation, you have to accept that your ideas may need to be modified considerably to fit the context, that some people will be obstructionist, or that your proposal may be flatly denied.

Activity 11.3: Your Dream Project

One of the advantages of working in higher education is considerable autonomy in selecting projects; in most other occupations, people are assigned to work on what others deem important. What project can you envision that would simultaneously stimulate your thinking and fire your enthusiasm?

Table 11.4 suggests strategies for generating more than one scholarly outcome from a similar body of work.

Table 11.4 Managing multiple projects

Begin with class notes. An English professor began by conducting a review of the literature on writers' groups that was shared during a doctoral seminar he was responsible for teaching. Then he planned a writers' retreat for local colleagues, began a writers' group, published a practical article about the experience, and published a qualitative research article based on interviews with the participants
Branch out from community service. That time-consuming service project can become a practical article if it is written in the structure best suited for descriptions of projects, namely: needs assessment, design/planning, implementation, and outcomes/evaluation. Writing the article this way also forms the foundation for a grant proposal
Write two manuscripts simultaneously. Try writing an article for the layperson at the same time that you are writing a manuscript for scholars. Each time a portion of the work sounds like something professionals would already know, move it to the article for nonspecialists
Move from small project to larger projects. For instance, you could write the abstract and proposal for a conference presentation, expand the idea into a paper informally published as conference proceedings, advance to publish a review of the literature or original research as an article or book chapter, and ultimately pursue a book contract—all on the same basic topic
Write while developing a program. Prior research shows that time spent writing grants is positively associated with conducting research (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2007). So, use a grant to support a project as the basis for writing a practical article. See "The Program-Page Connection: A Practical Model for Professional Writing" (Smith & McLaurin, 1999) posted at http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ592633
Use teamwork to tackle a formidable task. A faculty member/program director from Vocational Education, a professor of history/philosophy, and a statistician took on the huge task of analyzing exit survey data the first author had collected over a 5-year period. The strengths of each collaborator yielded a very different manuscript from the one the first author would have produced independently
Switch between research and practice. If you have been publishing more theory and research, collaborate with some highly respected practitioners to generate a practical article. If you have been writing mainly practical articles, pursue a line of research with the support of a more experienced researcher
Repurpose a failed manuscript. If a grant was not funded, could it be modified for another grants competition? Might the literature review section be expanded into an article? Could elements of a manuscript become a class activity? How about a conference proposal?
Apply for awards. If your work has been well-received, explore the different awards and forms of recognition at your institution, in your professional organizations, and conferred by other groups. For example, many professional groups give awards for outstanding dissertations, for service to the group, or to promising new researchers. Review all of the criteria and apply well in advance because these awards typically require letters of support from others

Activity 11.4: Identifying Spin-Offs

Using the strategies in Table 11.4, what possibilities can you envision for maximizing your output of scholarly work? Make a three-column list with the headings of teaching, research, and service. Then use arrows to identify connections across the columns.

Grants as Writing Opportunities

When you think about it, highly productive faculty members are making proposals to undertake new projects all of the time. They propose new courses, programs, projects, books, and so forth. They request release time from teaching, travel support, sabbatical leaves, and training opportunities. They send in their applications and CVs to be considered for honors and awards. Although it is common to refer to writing grants, what people actually mean by that is writing the a formal request/application, in the form of a proposal, to get financial support for a project or research. What proposal writers actually are seeking is a contract—a work order from the grantor that makes the expectations explicit (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 2013).

A doctoral student in science confided that she once attended a grant writing workshop and the presenter included an anonymous excerpt from "the worst grant proposal we ever received". As she began reading the material projected on the screen, the student was stunned to realize it was a proposal that she had submitted! Why had the proposal failed so miserably? It was because she wrote an impassioned plea for an audience consisting of like-minded colleagues when actually, the reviewers were nonspecialists seeking assurances that the money would be yield impressive results. It was not the case that she was a terrible writer, incapable of generating a high-quality grant proposal, or had a useless project in mind. However, she did not have a rudimentary understanding of grant writing, was operating on the wrong set of assumptions, and had failed to prepare herself adequately.

Several things about this event are noteworthy. First, the student went on to defend her dissertation successfully, publish her work, and get grant funding. Second, she was already taking positive action to remedy the problems of her first attempt at grant writing and improve her skills. Third, she shared her mortifying experience with her classmates in a doctoral course in the hopes that it might prevent others from making a similar mistake. Her sincere desire to improve, ability to rebound, and generosity in helping others controlled the damage that initial failure could have done.

Online Tool Refer to University of North Carolina's Writing Center website for guidance on writing grant proposals at http://writingcenter.unc.edu/handouts/grant-proposals-or-give-me-the-money/

Grant writing is an evidence-based, persuasive writing task:

> A proposal's overt function is to persuade a committee of scholars that the project shines with the three kinds of merit all disciplines value, namely, conceptual innovation, methodological rigor, and rich, substantive content….Other things being equal, the proposal that is awarded funding is the one that gets its merits across more forcefully. (Przeworski and Salomon, 1995, p. 1)

Nationally, only about 10 % of the grant projects that are proposed are funded (Bourne & Chalupa, 2006)—a rate somewhat higher than the acceptance rate of many prestigious journals. How can you improve chances for success? The best way to gain support for such proposals is to study the guidelines, start the process very early, get feedback from knowledgeable others, revise the proposal accordingly, and submit all materials exactly as required. As with writing journal articles, audience awareness is crucial. Many times, your audience for a grant proposal consists of people who do not share your area of expertise. If competing for an "in-house" small grant at your institution, for example, the reviewers are likely to be a university-wide committee with varied areas of specializations. If competing for a grant in the local or larger community, the evaluators probably will be business people from the area. For state, federal and nonprofit grants, the evaluators are apt to be a distinguished, diverse group with little knowledge about your specific project or even your discipline (see CDC guidelines). Grant proposals fail when they take a "give me the money" approach and fail to show how others will benefit. They also fail when they take a "me too" approach and propose something that is routine, ordinary, and unremarkable. Table 11.5 contains a self-questioning framework that takes these audiences into account (Lunghofer, 2015).

Table 11.5   11 questions winning grant writers can answer

Before you start writing your next grant proposal, make sure you can answer these questions:
1. What problem or issue will your proposed project solve or address?
2. Why is it important to address this issue?
3. What will be different as a result?
4. How will you measure or document your results?
5. How does what you are proposing fit into your organization's strategic plan?
6. Why is it important in the context of that plan?
7. What is your overall funding strategy?
8. How do grants in general and this grant in particular fit into that funding strategy?
9. How will the work accomplished under the auspices of the grant be sustained when the grant period ends?
10. Why should funders care about this issue?
11. How do the issue and your approach to addressing it match the funders' priorities or areas of focus?

Source: Lisa Lunghofer, Ph.D. www.makinggoodwork.org Good Causes • Great Results

Activity 11.5: First Steps Toward Grant Writing

Using Lunghofer's questions that a grant writer needs to answer in Table 11.5 as a framework, write a brief answer to every question. Be sure that you are client-centered in your approach and that your answers are fashioned to your primary audience—the reviewers from the funding agency.

Grant funding can be tricky because it is affected by (1) the funding agency, (2) the discipline and (3) the institution. To illustrate a particular funder's expectations, the director of a multi-million dollar foundation grant once told me that, when the short list of finalists came to make their presentations to the Board, only a few of them thought to include teachers, staff, parents, and students. From the committee's perspective, it was a serious oversight to send "only the suits" from the central office when the grant initiative was focused on all of the stakeholders. So, when in doubt, they tended to rule in favor of those teams that demonstrated this inclusiveness. Knowledge of the priorities of the funding group is critical. The two broad categories of grants—those that support original research and those that fund service projects—require very different types of proposals.

From a disciplinary perspective, expectations for writing grants often differ considerably. Just think about how different the style of these grant proposals would be: an artist seeking support to produce creative work, an English professor conducting research on second language writing, a psychologist implementing a suicide prevention program for teenagers, and a medical research team conducting drug trials.

The expectations of the grant writer's institution are pertinent as well. For faculty at major research institutions, success in attracting grant funding often is a key factor in tenure and promotion. In a way, major grant funding functions as verification that a faculty member's research or innovative project rose to the top among those proposed by other academics. All three influences—the funder, the discipline, and the institution—must be taken into consideration before you begin. It is a good idea to read through a general treatment of grant writing skills for the layperson could have prevented some of these beginner mistakes (Karsh & Fox, 2014).

Online Tool Take a short course in grant writing through The Foundation Center, available in four different languages, that will guide you through the proposal writing process http://foundationcenter.org/getstarted/tutorials/shortcourse/info.html

Activity 11.6: Thinking Through a Grant Project

Barbara Davis (2005) http://www.mcf.org/system/article_resources/0000/0325/writingagrantproposal.pdf) suggests that grant writers use the following questions to guide them in explaining the details of the project. Try writing a response to each one: Who is the target audience, and how will you involve them in the activity? How many people do you intend to serve? What are you going to do? What project planning has already taken place? Who is going to do the work and what are their credentials? When will the project take place? Where will the project take place? Use your answers to begin drafting a grant proposal (Table 11.6).

Table 11.6 Advice on securing grants

1. **Identify resources**. Your institution probably will sponsor at least one grant-writing workshop each year and may have a grants office to assist you. Major universities post grant writing tips, PowerPoints from presentations, and other resources for faculty. Don't forget to search the funding organizations. At the least, they will have detailed guidelines posted

2. **Study exemplary proposals**. Study examples of well-written grant proposals such as "The Healthy Marriages Program" to support successful re-entry of prisoners into family life (McLaughlin & Jordan, 1999) or a cross-age tutoring program for children from Children, Youth & Families at Risk (CYFR) (see the example that begins on page 10 of http://www.innonet.org/resources/files/CommProject_Eval_Guide.pdf. Ask the grants office at your institution to see examples of funded proposals. Perhaps the best source for examples of successful projects with a comprehensive evaluation plan is a journal called *New Directions in Evaluation*

3. **Look before you write**. Increasingly, funding agencies require a letter of intent or a very brief proposal and review those first. This saves them many wasted hours because they invite a small number of proposals from the best ones identified during the preliminary review. As you might imagine, this procedure makes that short document very important. Try to identify some excellent examples by working with your grants office, asking colleagues, and attending conferences/trainings

4. **Volunteer to evaluate proposals**. Most universities have some small "seed money" grants and need committee members to evaluate them. Serving in this capacity can help you to internalize the expectations of proposal review committees. Look for opportunities to review proposals within your professional associations as well

5. **Investigate modest funding streams**. Many times, grant writers attempt to compete with the most experienced grants writers for multi-million dollar awards rather than honing their craft first with small grants programs. Be aware that, because the funding agency wants to be assured of results, their scoring rubric may give points for affiliation with a major research university and a history of successful grants. If you have neither, you may want to join someone who does. There may be few applicants for small grants and scholarships; in fact, these sources of support sometimes go unclaimed in any given year. Many businesses, institutions, professional organizations, honor societies, and institutions of higher education operate small grants programs

6. **Seek additional training**. Large higher education institutions often have a person in charge of grants who will make presentations to a group or consult with individual faculty members on their proposals. Webinars and YouTube videos also provide free training from experts. Find out who the successful grant writers at your institution are and ask for their advice

7. **Be client-centered**. Although there are grants to support individual faculty research, it is more commonly the case that a grant is a project designed to help others. This makes it very important to write proposals that focus on benefits for the end-users

8. **Demonstrate collaboration**. When your proposal demonstrates that you have convinced others to work with you, it communicates two important points. First, others have given the project their "seal of approval" and second, you know how to mobilize human and material resources effectively to achieve your goals

9. **Observe deadlines and plan for time sinks**. Most institutions require a sign off from your dean. You won't want to invest months in preparing a proposal only to get bogged down because an administrator is traveling when you need a signature

10. **Understand your institution's policies regarding grants**. For example, you may be seeking release time to serve as the project coordinator and find out that your university has restrictions on this or that this budget line was cut when the proposal was funded

(continued)

Table 11.6 (continued)

11. **Work with the funding group**. The reviewers are not the enemy. Be mindful of reviewers' time and make your proposal clear, concise, and complete. Follow the guidelines. Find out who the grant administrator is and do your homework. What projects are they particularly proud of? It might be useful to make brief contact with the administrator of the grant program; ask for advice from knowledgeable colleagues on this
12. **Write as you go**. Instead of waiting until the project report deadline arrives to begin writing, start writing a related journal article or book chapter while the grant is underway. This not only makes for a better report—perhaps one worthy of additional financial support in the coming year—but also increases the likelihood that at least one publication will emanate from the project
13. **Keep searching for support**. If you were awarded one grant, it improves your chances of getting another one. Each award received is a vote of confidence in the project that can be leveraged into additional funding. If you were denied a grant, search for alternative sources of support and repurpose the proposal for the new funding source. After you have implemented a project successfully, think about ways to expand the initiative to other contexts

Writing Tasks Associated with Grants

Our purpose here is not to duplicate some of the books on writing grant proposals that have survived to multiple editions (e.g., Gitlin & Lyons, 2014; Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 2013). Our goal is to look at grants from a writing perspective. The writing tasks can be categorized as three phases:

- Pre-proposal: This is all of the work that goes into applying for the grant. Some typical writing tasks at this phase include the title, an abstract, preparing a letter of intent, filling out an application form, and abbreviated methods of envisioning the project (i.e., creating tables and flow charts of the process or a timeline).
- Proposal stage: This is when the grant proposal is fleshed out. The online tools that follow will guide you through that process.
- Post award stage: After the contract is issued, multiple types of data will need to be gathered and compiled to chart progress toward achieving goals, make adjustments to the original plan as needed, and document that results were achieved.
- Grant completion stage: Recipients of grants will need to write an evaluation report. If there is an opportunity to reapply for another year, a new proposal may need to be prepared. Dissemination of the project through presentations and publications often is the most persuasive evidence of effectiveness.

Online Tool Review University of Michigan professor Levine's (2015) suggestions on writing each part of the grant proposal and examples of each one (title, background, problem statement, goals and objectives, project detail [clientele, methods, staff/administration], available resources, needed resources [personnel, facilities, equipment/supplies/communication, budget], evaluation plan, and appendix). http://www.learnerassociates.net/proposal/

When it comes to working with grants, it is important to be realistic about what you can accomplish and the demands associated with successfully completing the work. A colleague who collaborated with several other universities to secure a federal grant was fond of saying: "The good news is, we got the grant; the bad news is, we got the grant." As his statement suggests, applicants for grant funds need to be aware that the work has barely begun until after the contract is awarded. Grant projects represent huge investments of time and energy.

Building in an Assessment Plan

As a doctoral student, I enrolled in a required course on evaluation models and, even though the instructor was well-known in the field, his teaching methods made the class difficult for me to tolerate. He would arrive at class each day with a stack of books marked with post-it notes and proceed to read aloud passages from each book. For the remainder of the class, we were put into groups to work on a program evaluation. Nearly all of the projects were outside my field, so I assumed there was little to be learned. I sold back my book to the bookstore for a few dollars rather than keep it as I had my other texts. Shortly after I was hired as a faculty member, the dean encouraged me to attend a three-day federal grant writing workshop in Washington, DC with three other faculty members. Much to my surprise, most of what was shared had been addressed in that course I wished I could drop. Actually, material from that course probably has been more widely applicable in my professional life than the material from any other course in my program. I even ended up purchasing the latest edition of the textbook (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2011) and teaching a similar course to doctoral students myself.

An evaluation plan assures funding agencies that the money would be well spent. One of the most important—yet frequently shortchanged—aspects of a grant proposal is the evaluation plan. A clear assessment strategy that specifies outcomes consistent with the funding agency's goals and clearly linked to the project's purpose and objectives is the surest way to convey this information. Increasingly, funding agencies are looking for what are referred to as "theory of change" approaches (Taplin & Clark, 2012), evaluation models (Posavac, 2011; Stufflebeam & Shrinkfield, 2007), or "logic models" (Crawley, 2001; Graig, 2016; Knowlton & Phillips, 2012)

Online Tools To understand logic models, begin with a simple example—the process of buying a home from Innovation Network http://www.innonet.org/client_docs/File/logic_model_workbook.pdf Next, watch the narrated PowerPoint Tutorial from Usable Knowledge, LLC http://www.usablellc.net/resources/logic-model-tutorial and study How to Write the Evaluation Section of Grant Proposal http://www.usablellc.net/White_Papers/Evaluation%20for%20Grant%20Writers.pdf

Those who are awarded a grant surely will need to write an evaluation report and submit it. This can be a particularly high-stakes writing task for multi-year projects. Be sure to gather all of the evaluation data along the way rather than waiting until the deadline for the report. That is the surest way to have what you need in order to prepare a compelling argument that the money was well invested, that the project was worthwhile, and that it merits continued support. The American Evaluation Association (2004) has established guidelines for writing evaluation reports (Yarbrough, Shula, Hopson, & Caruthers, 2010). Use the guidelines in Table 11.7 to guide you in preparing a report.

Too often, the work that is done in conjunction with grants is known only to the participants. Wider dissemination is one convincing way to persuade the funders that the project was particularly meritorious. Plan to make a presentation at a major conference and/or to publish an article, book chapter, or book about the grant activity. Generating presentations and publications from grants makes the most of your efforts (Sternberg, 2014).

Ethical Aspects of Multiple Projects

Whenever we conduct workshops on writing for publication, one common question has to do with "working smarter"—in other words, how can scholars maximize the time invested in scholarly activities? Without a doubt, generating multiple scholarly products from a body of work has appeal. One word of caution has to do with self-plagiarism. Self-plagiarism also occurs when authors take essentially the same piece of writing and present it as something new. After work has been accepted for publication, authors are routinely required to sign a copyright transfer agreement. You cannot use any of the same wording or you will plagiarize yourself (Stichler & Nielsen, 2014). This is sometimes surprising to faculty members who see it as "their" work, to use as they wish. But, most of the time, the copyright is, just as the agreement form indicates, a *transfer* of copyright to another entity, so you would need to get written permission to use the entire piece for another purpose or to quote from it extensively.

Online Tool
The fillable pdf of the Wiley Blackwell Copyright Transfer Form https://www.pdffiller.com/en/project/31141754.htm?form_id=16585 is typical of the terms authors agree to when publishing their work.

Baggs (2008) and others have described the pitfalls of trying to publish too many articles from one data set—what they refer to as "salami science" because the body

Table 11.7 Questions to guide writing an evaluation report

Criterion		
1	Stakeholder identification	Are the audiences clearly defined to include their perspectives? Does the report thoroughly explain how the evaluation information will address their needs? Are the needs of various audiences discussed/juxtaposed?
2	Report clarity	Does the report clearly and accurately describe the program, including its context, stakeholders, purposes, and curriculum? Are descriptions thorough, elegant, comprehensive, and fully supported by the data?
3	Values identification	Are the rationale and standards used to guide the evaluation, interpret the findings, and make value judgments that are insightful, fully justified, and comprehensive?
4	Evaluation impact	Does the evaluation use compelling evidence to offer clear and appropriate direction for programmatic improvement that would enhance the mission/goals of the program?
5	Feasibility	Is there ample evidence that the evaluation was conducted in a practical and efficient way that was response to the context/culture?
6	Resource analysis	Are estimates of time and money detailed and defensible? Does the report include a thoughtful analysis of the available resources?
7	Management plan	Does the management plan specify dates for various activities and identify potential pitfalls so that stakeholders can track progress and avert problems with keeping the evaluation on schedule?
8	Ethical issues	Do the methods, data, and narrative indicate that the evaluator exhibited legal, ethical, and due regard for protecting the welfare of those involved in the evaluation?
9	Description of methods and sources of information	Are the descriptions of methods and sources thorough, elegant, comprehensive, and fully supported by the data?
10	Valid and reliable information	Are the information gathering methods chosen, developed, and implemented to assure that both the evidence and its interpretation are valid and reliable?
11	Justified conclusions and recommendations	Does the evaluator draw critical, insightful conclusions and make recommendations that are explicitly justified with connections to the evidence?
12	Other, e.g., timely delivery	Was the report submitted in advance for corrective feedback and is the final copy delivered on the due date?

This scoring rubric is based on the American Evaluation Association's (2004) Guiding Principles for Evaluators

of work is shaved very thin. The issue is serious, as evidenced by this excerpt from guidelines by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (2016):

> The author must alert the editor if the manuscript includes subjects about which the authors have published a previous report or have submitted a related report to another publication. Any such report must be referred to and referenced in the new paper. Copies of such material should be included with the submitted manuscript to help the editor decide how to handle the matter. If redundant or duplicate publication is attempted or occurs without such notification, authors should expect editorial action to be taken. (Section III.D.2)

This does not mean that one cannot legitimately divide a dissertation or other large research project into meaningful segments for publication. It does mean that doing so requires thoughtful planning and careful communication with the editor. Multiple publications on the same topic may make it difficult to avoid self-plagiarism (Broome, 2004). For example, if the dissertation literature review is published as a review article, it is challenging to write new background sections for related articles. One approach is to target literature for data based articles that specifically supports that narrower topic, making it easier to synthesize the literature in such a way that it does not duplicate the earlier publication.

Conclusion

One day a letter arrived in the mail from the Rockefeller Foundation. The letter looked, as the British would say, very posh with high rag-content paper and embossed gold lettering. At first, I assumed it was a call for donations and was so busy at the time that I nearly discarded it without opening it but then decided to look inside. The letter read, "Dear Dr. Jalongo: We have read your book *Teachers*' *Stories*: *From Personal Narrative to Professional Insight* with great interest and resonated to your work." The letter went on to state that The Rockefeller Foundation had funded a 13 million dollar initiative to support the development of everyone in eight urban schools—students, parents and other community members, teachers, administrators, and staff members; it was called the Learning Communities Network. As part of that project, they were going to produce a publication called *Narratives* and I was invited to serve on the Editorial Board. The financial compensation was a modest honorarium each year but the opportunity was of inestimable value. The way we worked was that manuscripts would come in—many written by first-time authors—and members of the Editorial Board would discuss them during a conference call. One of our favorites had been written by a janitor who was required to earn his General Education Diploma in order to retain employment at the school district. He described how he felt resentful of this at first but, after beginning the classes, his resolve to earn the GED was built by working within a supportive learning community. Sadly, shortly after he earned his diploma, his father was hospitalized and diagnosed with a terminal illness. He took the diploma with him to show his father, who beamed with pride at his son's accomplishment before he passed away a few days later. This project was a continual source of inspiration and education for me. Several of the schools were in

areas where Spanish was spoken, so the publication had the unique feature of being published in English on one side of the page and Spanish on the reverse side and all the reader had to do was flip it over. Children produced the art for the cover. The other Board members were people whose work I had admired. Several of us presented at a national conference together. Many times rewards have less to do with financial compensation and more with learning opportunities.

The last, great outgrowth of a professional career is professional wisdom. Choosing your projects wisely gives you the greatest opportunity to attain that goal. Sternberg (2004) proposed a theory of wisdom in which wise decisions are made only when:

- The common good is considered
- Multiple interests (i.e., intrapersonal, interpersonal, extrapersonal) are balanced
- Consequences are considered over time (i.e., short-term, long-term)
- Environmental contexts are taken into account (e.g., adapting/shaping existing contexts or selecting new contexts) and all of the preceding items (1–4) are:
- Influenced by a system of values.

Wisdom is what makes our professional lives more productive and satisfying across the lifespan.