UNIVERSITY *of* HOUSTON

GRADUATE COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK   WWW.SW.UH.EDU

COURSE TITLE/SECTION: SOCW 8327/30288—Grant Writing

TIME: Tuesdays 8:30 AM – 11:30 PM (Spring 2013)   **Room:** SW-425

FACULTY: Luis R. Torres, PhD   **OFFICE HOURS**: Mondays, 1:00 PM–5:00 PM
                                                      & by appointment (SW-303)

E-mail: LRTorres@uh.edu   **Phone:** (713) 743-8512   **FAX:** (713) 743-3985

I.   Course

A. Catalog Description. Cr. 3. (3-0). Pre-requisite: Doctoral standing or permission of the instructor. Prepares students for identifying, planning, collaborating, writing, budgeting, submitting, tracking, revising and managing grants.

B. Purpose. This course introduces the student to the process of grantsmanship. This includes knowledge of sponsors and opportunities as well as practical "know-how" in writing competitive grants for supporting research in social service and health service provision. The emphasis of the course will be on federal grants, but state and foundation grants will also be cited as case illustrations.

II.   Course Objectives

A. Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of a wide array of federal and foundation grant sources;
2. Interpret grant program announcements;
3. Plan grant writing strategies;
4. Match intellectual interests with appropriate sponsor research areas;
5. Demonstrate an understanding of key elements in research design and methods that are sought by sponsors;
6. Develop and justify grant budgets;
7. Demonstrate an understanding of the process used to procure letters of support and intent; and
8. Delineate ethical issues related to the protection of human subjects and the role of the IRB.

III.   Course Structure

A. Course Content. This course will include the following topical (content) areas:

1. A thorough review of grant mechanisms to support social/human services and health and mental health research. The focus will be on federal NIH

grants, **particularly dissertation support (R36, F31)** and early career funding (T and K awards, R03 and R21 mechanisms). Dissertation support from sources other than NIH (e.g., NASW, SSWR, and APA fellowships) will also be covered. Other federal, state and foundation grants will also be discussed, but will not be the focus of the class.

2. In-depth discussion on how to understand and respond to program announcements (PA's), requests for proposals (RFP's), and other types of funding announcements. This will include identifying the right funding mechanism for the researcher's interest and career stage.

3. Understanding the grant submission and peer review process and the scoring of grant proposals, with a particular focus on the NIH review and scoring criteria. NIH protocols and procedures have changed significantly in recent years, and we will discuss the most current ones. We will also discuss various ways to stay abreast of changes.

4. **The main thrust of the class will be hands-on practice on grant writing, from early conceptualization of research ideas and literature review, to refining concepts, writing the various pieces of the proposal (including IRB/human subject's and securing linkages and letters of support), putting the full proposal together, and submitting the grant application (with a focus on the electronic submission process, now required for all NIH grants). The emphasis will be on writing a proposal for dissertation funding, but other relevant mechanisms will also be covered (i.e., NIH small research grant or R03; K and T awards; professional organization awards (i.e., fellowships); and the GCSW Doctoral Qualifying Paper.)**

5. Learning how to respond to reviewer's comments and prepare a revised application. It is exceedingly rare for researchers to be funded on first submission. Thus, understanding and responding to reviewers' comments and submitting a revised application are critical elements of successful grantsmanship.

6. **This class is not a research methods class, and it is not a class on statistical analyses**. Students are expected to have completed methodology and statistics courses prior to or concurrently with this class. While we will discuss various methodological and analytical issues and concepts as they relate to specific research hypotheses, they are not the focus of the class. The focus of the class is on understanding the grant writing process and on writing grant applications that have a high probability of being funded.

7. **The class is also not a project management class**. Demonstrating to reviewers that one has the proper resources, knowledge, and experience to effectively manage a grant-funded project is a critical issue. As such, we will discuss in class how to convey this to reviewers in the proposal. However,

in-depth coverage of grants management is beyond the purview of this course.

B. Course Structure.

1. The spring 2013 semester course will consist of 14 three-hour classes, plus outside readings and assignments.

2. Classes will include lectures facilitated by the professor; brief guest lectures by faculty who have successfully applied for various funding opportunities; work in small groups; student submissions (segments of proposal throughout semester and final proposal at the end); and an on-going internal peer-review system (discussed later). Students will also be made aware of relevant activities (conferences, workshops, etc.) outside of class and encouraged to attend.

3. Class attendance, student participation, and reading assigned materials are all required. The more prepared students are for class, the more they will get out of the class. **It is the instructor's goal that at the end of the course the student will have a complete, solid draft of a dissertation funding proposal ready for submission.**

IV. Textbooks

A. Required Texts & Reading. There are two required textbooks. One has been ordered through the campus bookstore and through the M. D. Anderson library, and one is available at no cost from the National Academies Press:

1. Scheier, L. M., & Dewey, W. L. (2008). *The Complete Writing Guide to NIH Behavioral Science Grants.* New York: Oxford University Press.

2. Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy; National Academy of Sciences; National Academy of Engineering; & Institute of Medicine. (2009). *On Being a Scientist: A Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research: Third Edition.* Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. [Available at no cost from http://books.nap.edu/].

3. PHS 398: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Public Health Service Grant Application and SF424 (R&R): Application and Electronic Submission Information. Microsoft Work and Adobe PDF files (including fillable forms) available from http://grants.nih.gov/grants/forms.htm at no cost. This website will always have the most recent forms, so it is best to bookmark it and download the forms for each use, rather than downloading a copy of the form and saving it. This way you will always be using the most recent forms.

B. Recommended Texts. The texts listed below include additional grant-writing resources. Other texts are listed covering areas such as APA style,

quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, statistical analyses, ethics, understanding and reviewing the scientific literature, and evidence-based social work practice. Students are encouraged to select those that meet their individual needs.

1. American Psychological Association. (2009). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Sixth Edition*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association Press.

2. Berg, B. L. (2009). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences, 7th Edition*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

3. Brewer, E. W., & Achilles, C. M. (2008). *Finding Funding: Grantwriting From Start to Finish, Including Project Management and Internet Use*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press/Sage.

4. Drake, B., & Jonson-Reid, M. (2008). *Social Work Research Methods: From Conceptualization to Dissemination*. Boston: Pearson Education Inc./Allyn & Bacon.

5. Field, Andy. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS, Third Edition*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc.

6. Field, Andy, & Miles, J. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SAS*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc.

7. Greene, Jennifer C. (2007). *Mixed Methods in Social Inquiry*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

8. Greenhalgh, T. (2010). *How to Read A Paper: The Basics of Evidence-Based Medicine, Fourth Edition*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell/BMJ Books.

9. Hamilton, L. C. (2009). *Statistics with Stata (Updated for Version 10)*. Australia: Brooks/Cole Cengage Learning.

10. Holosko, Michael J. (2006). *Primer for Critiquing Social Research: A Student Guide*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Cengage Learning.

11. Kline, Rex B. (2009). *Becoming a Behavioral Science Researcher: A Guide to Producing Research That Matters*. New York: The Guilford Press.

12. LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Conducting Ethnographic Research*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

13. O'Hare, T. (2005). *Evidence-Based Practices for Social Workers: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Chicago: Lyceum Books.

14. Pincus, H. A., Lieberman, J. A., & Ferris, S. (1999). *Ethics in Psychiatric Research: A Resource Manual for Human Subjects Protection*.

Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association.

15. Pyrczak, F. & Bruce, R.R. (2007). *Writing Empirical Research Reports: A Basic Guide for Students of the Social and Behavioral Sciences, Sixth Edition*. Los Angeles: Pyrczak Publishing.

16. Rubin, Allen & Babbie, Earl R. (2008). *Research Methods for Social Work, Sixth Edition*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Cengage Learning.

17. Russell, S. W., & Morrison, D. C. (2010). The Grant Application Writer's Workbook, National Institutes of Health Edition. Los Olivos, CA: Grant Writer's Seminars and Workshops. [Available from www.GrantCentral.com.]

18. Schensul, S. L., Schensul, J. J., & LeCompte, M. D. (1999). *Essential Ethnographic Methods*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

19. Shore, A. R., & Carfora, J. M. (2011). *The Art of Funding and Implementing Ideas: A Guide to Proposal Development and Project Management*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

20. Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). Using Multivariate Statistics, Fifth Edition. Boston: Pearson.

21. Warren, Carol A. B., & Karner, T. X. (2005). *Discovering Qualitative Methods*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Co.

22. Yuen, Francis K. O., & Terao, Kenneth, L. (2003). Practical Grant Writing & Program Evaluation. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Cengage Learning.

C. **Journal Articles.** Peer-reviewed journal articles will be assigned and will be required reading. Students will be expected to conduct individual literature searches and literature reviews according to their areas of research. The UH library has full text articles online through the electronic resources section. Students are encouraged to **register for remote access to the HAM-TMC Medical Library at the M. D. Anderson Library Service Desk**, which allows students to access other journal resources. Students are also encouraged to **obtain software to manage their references (e.g., Endnotes, Refworks, etc.)** and to seek training in the use of their preferred software. Lee Hilyer, Associate Librarian in the M. D. Anderson Library, is a great resource on the use of Endnotes and other bibliographic software and he maintains an Endnotes blog (lahilyer@uh.edu, 713-743-9714).

D. Relevant websites are listed in section X: Bibliography.

V.   Course Requirements

A. **Attendance and Participation/Reading Assignments.** Students must complete all assigned readings prior to class and actively engage in class discussion and activities. Attendance and participation will count toward the final class grade

(**10%** of grade). They may also be taken into consideration should a student's grade be marginal. Each absence will result in a 5 point loss, unless cleared a priori with the instructor and excused. Students are expected to notify the instructor via phone or email ahead of time, whenever possible, to inform him of lateness and/or any absence. More than 3 absences may automatically result in a lower letter grade, and the instructor reserves the right to ask the student to withdraw. With regards to participation, of particular importance will be the internal peer review mechanism discussed below.

B. **Written Assignments**. Students will be required to submit sections of their proposals (e.g., specific aims, background and significance, approach, etc.) as the semester proceeds, as per the outline in the syllabus. Alternate formats dictated by a particular dissertation funding source or announcement will be acceptable with prior approval from the instructor. Timely submission and resubmission of these sections accounts for **20%** of the final grade.

C. **A final, complete, submission-ready proposal for dissertation funding** will be due at the end of the semester and will be **45%** of the final grade.

D. **Projects**. The class will function as an **ongoing, internal peer-review group**. Beginning on **the 3ʳᵈ week of the semester**, students will hand in sections of their proposals, starting with the specific aims. Every week, students will review each other's work as follows:

1. Students distribute the section due for that week (e.g., specific aims) via email to the entire class list **no later than 3 days prior to class**.

2. Two primary reviewers will be appointed by the instructor ahead of time for each submission. These two students will be primarily responsible for reading the submitted section and providing detailed feedback in class, following a mock review panel format. The professor will distribute a list of primary reviewers for each week.

3. Other students (in addition to the two primary reviewers for each submission) will be expected to read the submitted section as well and to add their comments and feedback in class.

4. The student whose submission is being reviewed is expected to remain silent and non-defensive, and to take in the comments and suggestions of the primary reviewers and the rest of the class. Earlier in the process reviewers can ask the student whose submission is being reviewed for some clarification. Later in the semester, however, this will no longer be allowed. Remember that **NIH, NSF and Foundation reviews are blind and that the researcher whose grant is being reviewed is not in the room and cannot clarify reviewer misunderstandings or answer questions that may arise**. Thus, effective grant writing also involves anticipating reviewer's reactions, comments, and questions, and addressing them ahead of time through clear and concise writing.

5. Following this format, every week (starting week 3) students will present their work to be critiqued and be prepared to critique the work of fellow students. Active participation in the internal peer-review process (that is, providing feedback to other's work in class as scheduled) will be **20%** of the final grade.

E.   **Exams.** There will be quizzes throughout the semester place on Blackboard. These will be on assigned readings, and the purpose of the quizzes is to encourage students to stay on top of their readings. Quizzes account for **5%** of the final grade.

F. **Interruptions and distractions.** To avoid disruptions, students will turn off pagers, cell phones and other electronic devices during class. If special circumstances merit leaving a cell phone or beeper on, please discuss with the professor prior to the start of class. Laptops will be used regularly in class. Students are encouraged to use the laptop only for class purposes and to refrain from using them for anything unrelated to the class.

G. Summary of Class Requirements:

Attendance & Participation	10%
Timely submission/resubmission of proposal sections	20%
Peer Reviewer Role	20%
Final, complete proposal	45%
Unannounced Quizzes	5%
TOTAL	100%

VI.   Evaluation and Grading

A. Grade Distribution

A = 96 to 100 points	C+ = 76 to 79.9
A - = 92 to 95.9	C = 72 to 75.9
B + = 88 to 91.9	C- = 68 to 71.9
B = 84 to 87.9	D = 64 to 67.9
B- = 80 to 83.9	F = below 64 points

VII.   Policy on grades of I (Incomplete).
The grade of "I" (Incomplete) is a conditional and temporary grade given when students are either (a) passing a course or (b) still have a reasonable chance of passing in the judgment of the instructor but, for non-academic reasons beyond their control have not completed a relatively small part of all requirements. Students are responsible for informing the instructor immediately of the reasons for not submitting an assignment on time or not taking an examination. Students must contact the instructor of the course in which they receive an "I" grade to make arrangements to complete the course requirements. Students should be instructed not to re-register for the same course in a following semester in order to complete the incomplete requirements.

The grade of "I" must be changed by fulfillment of course requirements within one year of the date awarded or it changes automatically to an "F" (or to a "U" (Unsatisfactory) in S/U graded courses). The instructor may require a time period of less than one year to fulfill course requirements and the grade may be changed by the instructor at any time to reflect work complete in the course. The grade of "I" may not be changed to a grade of W.

VIII. Policy on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism.

Students are expected to demonstrate and maintain a professional standard of writing in all courses, do one's own work, give credit for the ideas of others, and provide proper citation of source materials. Any student who plagiarizes any part of a paper or assignment or engages in any form of academic dishonesty will receive an "I" for the class with a recommendation that a grade of F be assigned, subsequent to a College hearing, in accordance with the University policy on academic dishonesty. Other actions may also be recommended and/or taken by the College to suspend or expel a student who engages in academic dishonesty.

All papers and written assignments must be fully and properly referenced using APA style format (or as approved by the instructor), with credit given to the authors whose ideas you have used. If you are using direct quotes from a specific author (or authors), you must set the quote in quotation marks or use an indented quotation form. For all direct quotes, you must include the page number(s) in your text or references. Any time that you use more than four or five consecutive words taken from another author, you must clearly indicate that this is a direct quotation. Please consult the current APA manual for further information.

Academic dishonesty includes using any other person's work and representing it   as your own. This includes (but is not limited to) using graded papers from students who have previously taken this course as the basis for your work. It also includes, but is not limited to submitting the same paper to more than one class. If you have any specific questions about plagiarism or academic dishonesty, please raise these questions in class or make an appointment to see instructor. This statement is consistent with the University Policy on Academic Dishonesty that can be found in your UH Student Handbook.

IX. Course Schedule and Assignments

   A. Assignments: As per section V above.

   B. Course Schedule. The spring 2013 session runs for 14 weeks, from January 15th through April 23rd 2013. Class will meet **Tuesdays from 8:30 AM until 11:30 AM**, with a 10-minute break around 10:00 am.

   C. Consultation. The professor is available to speak with students before/after class, during office hours, or by appointment.

   D. Statement on changes to syllabus. Dr. Torres reserves the right to revise the syllabus content and/or schedule for time management or topical reasons.

E. Week-by-Week Schedule

Semester-at-a-Glance

Week	Date	Topic
1	Jan 15	Welcome/Class Overview; Introduction to NIH Grants/Funding Mechanisms: Finding the Match; Web Resources
2	Jan 22	NIH Peer Review Process; Specific Aims (Overview; Hypotheses)
3	Jan 29	Guest Presentations on Funding Successes (Dr. Torres away)
4	Feb 5	Specific Aims (Building Conceptual Models); Start Internal Peer Review
5	Feb 12	Research Strategy: Significance
6	Feb 19	Research Strategy: Innovation
7	Feb 26	Research Strategy: Approach (Overview of Research Design, Research Setting)
8	Mar 5	Research Strategy: Approach (Preliminary Studies; Specialized Personnel; Recruitment and Sampling)
---	No Class Mar 12	University of Houston Spring Recess: March 14—March 19
9	Mar 19	Research Strategy: Approach (Data Collection; Outcome Measures; Data Management and Quality Control)
10	Mar 26	Research Strategy: Approach (Data Analyses; Power Analysis; Human Subjects)
11	Apr 2	Biosketch; Environment; Budgets; Appendices
12	Apr 9	Electronic Submissions; Responding to Reviewers
13	Apr 16	Putting it all together; Work on Final Proposals
14	Apr 23	Putting it all together; Work on Final Proposals

Week 1: January 15, 2013

Topics:
- Welcome and class overview/review of syllabus
- Introduction to NIH Grants and Review of Funding Mechanisms
- Web Resources: NIH Reporter (Research Portfolio Online Reporting Tools; http://projectreporter.nih.gov/reporter.cfm); NIH Institutes and Forms (www.nih.gov; http://grants.nih.gov/grants/forms.htm).

Textbook Readings:
- Scheier & Dewey Forward, Overview, Chapter 3, and Appendices 1 and 2
- [Optional: Brewer & Achilles Introduction and Chs. 1-6]

Journal Articles:
- Inouye, S. K., & Fiellin, D. A. (2005). An evidence-based guide to writing grant proposals for clinical research. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 142(4), 274-282.

Week 2: January 22, 2013

Topics:
- NIH Peer Review Process
- Specific Aims (Overview; Constructing Hypotheses)

Textbook Readings:

- Scheier & Dewey Chapter 1-3, 6-7, 11-12
- [Optional: Brewer & Achilles Chapters 7-11 and 13; Kline, Chapter 9]

Journal Articles:
- Kotchen, T. A., Lindquist, T., Malik, K., & Ehrenfeld, E. (2004). NIH peer review of grant applications for clinical research. *JAMA, 291*(7), 836-843.
- Woolf, S. H. (2008). The meaning of translational research and why it matters. Journal of the American Medical Association, 299(2), 211-213.
- Brekke, J. S., Ell, K., & Palinkas, L. A. (2007). Translational Science at the National Institute of Mental Health: Can Social Work Take Its Rightful Place? Research on Social Work Practice, 17(1), 123-133. doi: 10.1177/1049731506293693

Week 3: January 29, 2o13

Topics:
- Guest Presentation on Funded Grant Submissions [Dr. Torres is away]

Textbook Readings:
- Continue with week 2 readings

Journal Articles:
- Continue with week 2 readings

Week 4: February 5, 2013

Topics:
- Specific Aims (Building Conceptual Models)
- **Draft 1 of Specific Aims Due; Start Internal Peer Review**

Textbook Readings:
- Scheier & Dewey Chapter 3

Journal Articles:
- Cortes, D. E., Deren, S., Andia, J., Colon, H., Robles, R., & Kang, S. Y. (2003). The use of the Puerto Rican biculturality scale with Puerto Rican drug users in New York and Puerto Rico. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 35*(2), 197-207.

Other:
- Goes, J. (2002). Variables, Relationships, Hypotheses: How to Build a Good Conceptual Model [PowerPoint Presentation].
- Hill-Briggs, H. (2008). Conceptual Model Building: Overview [PowerPoint Presentation].

Week 5: February 12, 2013

Topics:
- Research Strategy: Significance

Textbook Readings:
- Scheier & Dewey Chapter 3; Russel & Morrison, Chapter 9

Journal Articles:
- Satterfield, J. M., Spring, B., Brownson, R. C., Mullen, E. J., Newhouse, R. P., Walker, B. B., & Whitlock, E. P. (2009). Toward a Transdisciplinary Model of Evidence-Based Practice. *Milbank Quarterly, 87*(2), 368-390. doi: DOI 10.1111/j.1468-0009.2009.00561.x

Week 6: February 19, 2013

Topics:
- Research Strategy: Innovation
- Revised Draft of Specific Aims Due
- Internal Peer Review Process

Textbook Readings:
- Scheier & Dewey Chapter 3; Russel & Morrison, Chapter 9

Journal Articles:
- Abraham, A. J., Knudsen, H. K., Rothrauff, T. C., & Roman, P. M. (2010). The adoption of alcohol pharmacotherapies in the Clinical Trials Network: The influence of research network participation. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 38*(3), 275-283. doi: DOI 10.1016/j.jsat.2010.01.003

Week 7: February 26, 2013

Topics:
- Research Strategy: Approach (Overview of Research Design, Research Setting)
- **First Draft of Innovation Due**
- Internal Peer Review Process

Textbook Readings:
- Scheier & Dewey Chapter 3; Russel & Morrison, Chapter 10; Kline Chapters 3-5

Journal Articles:
- Martinez, K., Callejas, L., & Hernandez, M. (2010). Community-Defined Evidence: A Bottom-Up Behavioral Health Approach to Measure What Works in Communities of Color. *Report on Emotional and Behavioral Disorders in Youth, 10*(1), 11-16.
- McBeath, B., Briggs, H. E., & Aisenberg, E. (2010). Examining the Premises Supporting the Empirically Supported Intervention Approach to Social Work Practice. *Social Work, 55*(4), 347-357.

Week 8: March 5, 2013

Topics:
- Research Strategy: Approach (Preliminary Studies; Specialized Personnel;

Recruitment and Sampling)
- **First Draft of Approach (Overview of Research Design, Research Setting) Due**
- Internal Peer Review Process

Textbook Readings:
- Russel & Morrison, Chapters 10 & 11; Kline Chapter 6

Journal Articles:
- Abramovitz, D., Volz, E. M., Strathdee, S. A., Patterson, T. L., Vera, A., Frost, S. D. W., & ElCuete, P. (2009). Using Respondent-Driven Sampling in a Hidden Population at Risk of HIV Infection: Who Do HIV-Positive Recruiters Recruit? *Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 36*(12), 750-756. doi: Doi 10.1097/Olq.0b013e3181b0f311
- UyBico, S. J., Pavel, S., & Gross, C. P. (2007). Recruiting vulnerable populations into research: A systematic review of recruitment interventions. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 22*(6), 852-863. doi: DOI 10.1007/s11606-007-0126-3
- Frost, S. D. W., Brouwer, K. C., Cruz, M. A. F., Ramos, R., Ramos, M. E., Lozada, R. M., . . . Strathdee, S. A. (2006). Respondent-driven sampling of injection drug users in two US-Mexico border cities: Recruitment dynamics and impact on estimates of HIV and syphilis prevalence. *Journal of Urban Health-Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 83*(6), I83-I97. doi: DOI 10.1007/s11524-006-9104-z
- Yancey, A. K., Ortega, A. N., & Kumanyika, S. K. (2006). Effective recruitment and retention of minority research participants. *Annu Rev Public Health, 27*, 1-28.

[NO CLASS March 12: UH Spring Recess 3/11 to 3/17]

Week 9: March 19, 2013

Topics:
- Research Strategy: Approach (Data Collection; Outcome Measures; Data Management and Quality Control)
- **First Draft of Approach (Preliminary Studies; Specialized Personnel; Recruitment and Sampling) Due**
- Internal Peer Review Process

Textbook Readings:
- Kline Chapter 7

Journal Articles:
- Deardorff, J., Tschann, J. M., & Flores, E. (2008). Sexual Values Among Latino Youth: Measurement Development Using a Culturally Based Approach. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 14*(2), 138-146.
- NIMH Multisite HIV/STD Prevention Trial for African-American Couples Group. (2008). Measure of HIV/STD risk-reduction: Strategies for enhancing the utility

of behavioral and biological outcome measures for African American couples. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes, 49 (Suppl 1)*, S35-S41. doi: 10.1097/QAI.0b013e3181842536 00126334-200809011-00005 [pii]

Week 10: March 26, 2013

Topics:
- Research Strategy: Approach (Data Analyses; Power Analysis; Human Subjects)
- **First Draft of Approach (Data Collection; Outcome Measures; Data Management and Quality Control) Due**
- Internal Peer Review Process

Textbook Readings:
- Scheier & Dewey Chapters 4 & 16; Russel & Morrison, Chapter 16

Journal Articles:
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173-1182.
- Kraemer, H. C., Kiernan, M., Essex, M., & Kupfer, D. J. (2008). How and Why Criteria Defining Moderators and Mediators Differ Between the Baron & Kenny and MacArthur Approaches. *Health Psychology, 27*(2 (Suppl.)), S101-S108.
- Palmer, B. W., Dunn, L. B., Depp, C. A., Eyler, L. T., & Jeste, D. V. (2007). Decisional Capacity to Consent to Research Among Patients With Bipolar Disorder: Comparison With Schizophrenia Patients and Healthy Subjects. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 68*(5), 689-696.
- Smith-Tyler, J. (2007). Informed Consent, Confidentiality, and Subject Rights in Clinical Trials. *Proceedings of the American Thoracic Society*, 4(2), 189-193. doi: 10.1513/pats.200701-008GC

Week 11: April 2, 2013

Topics:
- Biosketch; Environment; Budgets; Appendices
- **Draft of Revised Specific Aims and Approach Due**
- Internal Peer Review Process

Textbook Readings:
- Scheier & Dewey Chapter 15; Russel & Morrison, Chapters 12-13

Journal Articles:
- TBA

Week 12: April 9, 2013

Topics:
- Electronic Submissions; Responding to Reviewers

- Draft of Biosketch, Environment, Budgets, and Appendices Due
- Internal Peer Review Process

Textbook Readings:
- Scheier & Dewey Chapters 17 & 18; Russel & Morrison, Chapters 12-13
- [Optional: Brewer & Achilles Chapter 12]

Journal Articles:
- TBA

Week 13: April 16, 2013

Topics:
- Putting it all together; Work on Final Proposals
- Complete Draft of Full Proposal Due for first half of class
- Internal Peer Review Process

Textbook Readings:
- Scheier & Dewey Chapter 19

Journal Articles:
- TBA

Week 14: April 23, 2013

Topics:
- Putting it all together; Work on Final Proposals
- **Final Proposal Due no later than May 7th , 2013 at 11:59 PM.**
- Internal Peer Review Process

X.   Americans with Disabilities Statement.

Whenever possible, and in accordance with 504/ADA guidelines, the University of Houston will attempt to provide reasonable academic accommodations to students who request and require them. Please call 713-743-5400 for more assistance. Instructors may not provide accommodations without supporting documentation from the UH Center for Students with DisAbilities.

XI.   Bibliography.

Recommended Websites.

Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC): http://www.cdc.gov/
Changing Minds Website List of Psychology Theories (with hyperlinks to descriptions)
    http://changingminds.org/explanations/theories/a_alphabetic.htm
CIA World Fact Book: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/
Council on Social Work Education http://www.cswe.org/
DSM-5: The Future of Psychiatric Diagnosis http://www.dsm5.org/Pages/Default.aspx
Foundation Center http://foundationcenter.org/
National Association of Social Workers http://www.naswdc.org/
National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities http://ncmhd.nih.gov/
National Institutes of Health http://www.nih.gov/
National Institutes of Health Office of Extramural Research http://grants.nih.gov/grants/oer.htm
NIH Enhancing Peer Review: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/reviewer_guidelines.htm
NIH Peer Review: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer_review_process.htm#scoring2
National Science Foundation http://www.nsf.gov/
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation http://www.rwjf.org/
Social Work Research Network: http://www.bu.edu/swrnet/
Society for Social Work and Research http://www.sswr.org/
Sociological Theories and Perspectives http://www.sociosite.net/topics/theory.php
Southwest Alternate Media Project http://www.swamp.org/
University of Twente (Netherlands) Alphabetic List of Theories (with hyperlinks to descriptions)
    http://www.utwente.nl/cw/theorieenoverzicht/Alphabetic%20list%20of%20theories/
US Census Bureau: http://www.census.gov/
US Census Bureau American FactFinder: www.factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en
US Dept. of Health & Human Services, Office of Minority Health: http://www.omhrc.gov/