

COM594 Funding and Grants

Developing Fundable Ideas

Benjamin Mako Hill

makohill@uw.edu

October 12, 2021

University of Washington

Department of Communication

Assistant Professor

Harvard University

Berkman Klein Center

Faculty Associate



Community
Data Science
Collective

1. Why this project?
2. Why you?
3. Why them?

Why this project?

Every step of the NSF evaluations asks for evaluation in terms of:

- Intellectual Merit
- Broader Impact

Work that has intellectual merit...

- is good scholarship research
- has solid methodology
- uses new and/or innovative approaches
- is rigorous and/or likely to succeed

Work that has **broader impact** is...

- is likely to “generalize” to other settings and/or explain other settings
- speaks to existing funding priorities

Work that has **broader impact** is...

- is likely to “generalize” to other settings and/or explain other settings
- speaks to existing funding priorities
- solves (or contributes to solving) “real world” problems
- is likely to affect fields beyond the academic discipline

Why you?

Making the case for funding **you** might involve...

- highlighting your training and/or record
- collaborators and co-PIs
- letters of support, collaboration, and/or endorsement
- making the case for communication (i.e., “x is a communication problem”)

Why them?

“Your proposal almost certainly will have to bridge at least two disparate bases of knowledge: The program officer’s expertise, and yours, since communication researchers almost always have to apply theory and perspective to an outside topic of study in order to attract a potential sponsor.”

— Dearing and Larson

Arguing for the *specific* case the funder cares about.