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**Exhibit 9.1 - Grant Task Preference Inventory Administration and**

 **Scoring Manual**

James E. McLean and David G. Bauer

**INTRODUCTION**

This inventory is designed to assist in building a team for the purpose of preparing a winning proposal and carrying out a successful grant-funded project. The authors have worked together in developing proposals and successfully completing them for millions of dollars of grant-supported projects and research over the past 40 years. While this is not a fail-safe instrument, it is designed to support the assembly of a team that includes the variety of skills needed for success and to allow team members to select the tasks in a successful grant development process that best match their skill sets and that they have a preference to perform.

We know that as individuals, we develop work styles and preferences that allow us to accomplish some tasks with less effort and more enjoyment than others. To maximize efficiency in a grant development team, the authors have identified many of the specific tasks required in a proactive success-based grant system explained in *The “How To” Grants Manual* (Bauer, 2015). The inventory requires respondents to select their most preferred and least preferred tasks from lists to match skill and interest sets, resulting in an overall picture of their most valuable contributions in a grant-seeking process. Selecting team members with complementary skill sets and interests maximizes the overall effectiveness of a team in the grant-seeking and grant-completion processes.

Our experience and the literature has helped us identify the following domains needed to maximize team effectiveness: Originator, Promoter, Implementer/Manager, and Analyst. We have also encountered people who operate equally in more than one of these domains. Most people operate in at least two of these domains with one being dominant. When a person is about equally matched to two or threeof these domains, we refer to that person as being in the “Generalist” domain.

While we acknowledge there are no cut and dried, clear rules that we each develop, there are preferences and skills that enhance our enjoyment and efficiency in our jobs. We can separate these tasks into the four domains. A team is most efficient if it includes at least one person who is adept at each of these domains. This inventory is designed to assist in identifying the preferred domains of potential team members to take advantage of their unique skills and preferences to maximize the overall effectiveness of the team. Following is a summary of the characteristics of people in each of the four domains.

Originator Domain

Individuals who operate in the originator domain are characterized by their ability to think outside the box and be comfortable with cognitive dissonance. Present them with a problem (the gap between what is and what should be) and they will generate ideas, solutions, and projects that are innovative and creative and push the boundaries of the field of interest. They love to brainstorm and provide breakthrough solutions that may go way beyond what the team envisions as possible and/or plausible. These creative individuals are an asset to a team when the team’s focus is on generating new, dynamicapproaches to a problem.

However, there are some drawbacks to being a member of this domain. The originator has little ownership or loyalty to his/her ideas and may even criticize or shoot them down as quickly as they are presented. Originators would rather develop a new approach than spend time defending or improvingtheir idea. Therefore, when others question one of their original ideas, they will quickly dismiss it and move on to developing a new idea. They may even challenge rules as they pursue new, original solutions. Indeed, some of the ideas may not be feasible under the current conditions.

Originators often become bored with an “old“ approach and want to move on to a new approach while the rest of the team is still focused on evaluating and improving the last idea. This can overwhelm and irritate team members of other domains. They desire to fully evaluate an idea before moving on.

Promoter Domain

Individuals who operate within this domain take a proposal idea/activity and plug or push it within and outside the organization or consortia. Once they believe that the approach to solving or reducing the problem is viable, they work to gain others’ approval for the solution, procure endorsements, and engage with the prospective grantor and past grantees. Individuals in this domain willrun interference and line up support while promoting the grant/proposal concept.

The promoter needs to have close contact with the implementer/manager on the team so that any possible shortcomings or mistakes in the implementation of the solution are corrected before promoting the project. The implementer/manager can act as the promoter’s “devil’s advocate.”The promoter can then confidently and enthusiastically move ahead in his or her role, knowing that possible flaws have been corrected.

It is the authors’ experience that few, if any, team members have promoter tendencies or preference. In seminars of 40 grant seekers, there are often no promoters in the group**.** This is in part because individuals in this domain are often perceived as self-promoters instead of team members actively pursuing an exciting grant idea. Individuals within this domain may be misunderstood and looked on as salespeople pushing ideas for personal gain.

Having no promoters on a team can become a problem when new and innovative proposal ideas lack an individual to champion the cause. Other domain team members may need to step up and take on these promotion-related tasks. Another option is to recruit individuals from the grants advisory group for the team to fill this void.This may include corporate supporters who have marketing skills that reinforce and characterize the role of the promoter.

Implementer/Manager Domain

As previously stated, individuals who operate from the implementer/manager domain are characterized as “devil’s advocates.” They preferthe task of identifying any flaws in the grant/proposal that will cause it to fall short of the goals and objectives outlined in the proposal/research design. The implementer/manager’s predisposition is to develop a clear and orderly process to identify flaws that jeopardize successful implementation.

Individuals in this domain want order in the universe. They will seek advice from others in their consortia and/or advisory committees. They will question protocols, come up with improved steps and procedures, and develop job descriptions, project planner spreadsheet and timelines as explained in *The “How To” Grants Manual* (Bauer, 2015). The implementer/manager is usually the detail-oriented person on the team.The authors’ experience has shown that individuals who operate out of this domain often constitute one-half of our grant’s seminar participants.

The implementer/manager prefers to control the expenditure of grant funds. Essential to developing the budget, these individuals want to keep the grant-funded project expenditures organized and accountable. They like to be in control, enjoy order, and dislike confusion. This sometimes creates conflicts with originator team members who are constantly coming up with new and/or better strategies.

Other members on their team may see their questioning as an unnecessary challenge to the proposal**.** In addition, because of their tendency to want a perfect proposal and a well-defined plan, the implementer/manager may encourage the team to incorporate more established, low-risk strategies. This may reduce the innovative and creative aspects of the grant/proposal and result in lower reviewer scores.

Analyst Domain

As the name suggests, people in this domain like to analyze. With respect to carrying out a successful grant-funded project, analysts will focus on finding the best grantor for the team’s grant/research idea. She or he enjoys developing the search terms for locating the “correct” grantor and likes establishing and evaluating the criteria for analyzing potential grantors. Analysts will want to know the background of the reviewers/decision makers and what criteria or scoring rubric will be used to evaluate the prospective grant/proposal.They will compare their team’s proposal to the prospective grantor’s funding interests and previously funded grants. Analysts will focus on proposal excellence. They will embrace concepts that lead to high-quality proposals that document the steps/protocols that close the gap outlined in the problem statement and result in the successful completion of the project.

Analyst usually have statistical and evaluation experience. They are quick to note that existing evaluation instruments may fall short of accurately documenting that the methods/protocols have affected the level of change expected in the grant. Analysts are essential to developing and adapting measurement instruments. A good analyst on the team usually results in improved grant ratings during the competition.

Generalist Domain

A few team members may have similarly positive scores in two or three of the domains.However, since the inventory is a forced choice instrument, it is not possible to have high positive scores in three domains. In fact, it is not possible to have positive scores in all four domains**.** People with positive scores in three domains are rare. But when this occurs, they can be valuable assets to a grant team. They feel comfortable operating in three domains and can fill in skills gaps as needed.However, these people may not display as much passion for a specific domain as an individual with a higher score in that domain. If a person has high scores in two or three domains, they will also not have selected some of the tasks on the inventory that are important for those domains. Thus, they may be less than enthusiastic about performing some of those tasks.

Summary

From the descriptions of the five domains, it is easy to see that it is important to include at least one person who performed highly in each of the first four domains or is a generalist who includes that domain as one of his or her positive scores. While it may be most preferable to have a person **fall** clearly into one of the domains, the potential flexibility of including a generalist should not be overlooked.

It should be noted that all of the tasks in the Grant Task Preference Inventory were adapted from Bauer (2015) and may not be applicable to tasks other than grant seeking and completion. Thus, the authors do not recommend the Inventory for purposes other than that in which it was intended. Further, this Inventory should be considered a beta version until more data are available to fully evaluate its validity.

**ADMINISTRATION**

The Grant Task Preference Inventory can be administered individually or in groups, but each person fills out the Inventory individually. The Inventory can be given to the respondent or passed out to the full group. All that is needed is a pencil or pen and a solid surface on which to write. The administrator reads the instructions aloud and asks if there are any questions. The instrument is not timed, but should take no longer than 15—20 minutes to complete.

There are no incorrect answers and there is not a preferred or perfect domain profile. Completing the inventory honestly will enable the team to evaluate the assets that the variety of skills and preferences provide for the desired result—a successfully completed grant.

**SCORING**

Scoring may be done by the individual responding to the instrument or by the administrator. It is possible to adapt the response sheet so that it can be machine scored. The appendix presents the scoring protocol. It lists each of the four domains with the 10 groups of tasks associated with that domain. The four steps for completing the scoring protocol are as follows:

1. On the scoring protocol, each of the 10 tasks marked with an “M” or “MOST” on the instrument are assigned a “+1.” The task statements on the inventory are listed by domain in the scoring protocol by the group in which they were presented. The easiest strategy is to look at each item and find the statement with the “M” on one of the four domains in the scoring protocol and place a +1 to the right of that statement. When completed, there should be a total of ten “+1s.”
2. Each of the 10 tasks on the instrument marked with an “L” or “LEAST” on the instrument is assigned a “-1” on the scoring protocol. Again, look at each item in the inventory and find the statement with the “L” on the one of the four domains in the scoring protocol and place a -1 to the right of that statement. Again, there should be a total of ten “-1s.”
3. When Steps 1 and 2 are complete, sum the scores for each domain. Assume any statement without a score to be zero (0). This provides the scores for each domain. The sum over the four domain scores should be equal to zero (0).
4. Transfer the domain scores to the scoring interpretation page of the protocol, listing the highest score first, then the next highest, to the lowest last. Circle the domain with the highest to the right. If more than one of the scores is positive, circle its domain also. The rest are listed in sequential order of magnitude.

**INTERPRETATION**

The inventory includes of 10 groups of four tasks to rate. In each group, the respondent has selected one task to assign an “M” for MOST preferred task and one task to assign an “L” for the LEAST preferred task in the grouping. Each “M” is scored as a +1 and each “L” is scored as a -1 in the particular domain where that task fell. If a task is assigned neither an “M” nor an “L”, its score is zero (0). The tasks fall in one of the following four domains: Originator, Analyst, Promoter, and Implementer/Manager. Once a +1, -1, or 0 is assigned to each task, the scores in each of the four domains are summed to determine the domain score.

The domain with the highest score is the respondent’s most preferred domain and that suggests that the respondent most prefers tasks in that domain. The domain with the second highest score is the respondent’s secondary domain and, if that is a positive score, is also a domain in which the respondent is comfortable working. If a respondent’s scores are about the same for two or three of the four domains, the respondent is a Generalist. That means that the respondent is comfortable in those two or three domains.

The scores in each domain can range from -10 to +10. In general, if a score is positive, that person is comfortable working on tasks in that domain. If a score is negative, generally, the person would prefer not to work on tasks in that domain. The closer a score is to +10 or -10, the more the person would prefer or not prefer tasks in that domain respectively. To be labeled a Generalist, the person would have to have positive scores in two or three domains with at least two of those scores being similar. In most cases, the fourth domain score would be negative and the respondent should avoid tasks in that domain.

It has been the authors’ experience that the most effective grant development and implementation teams are those that include at least one team member scoring high on one of the four domains or, if there is a generalist to cover the domains not covered by one of the other team members. This also helps the person directing the grant to assign tasks that will best fit each team member’s skills and preferences.
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**APPENDIX**

**SCORING PROTOCOL**

|  |
| --- |
| **ORIGINATOR DOMAIN** |
| Group | Statement | Score |
| 1 | Generate ideas that might lead to a fundable proposal. |  |
| 2 | Participate in a brainstorming exercise to find a solution to a problem. |  |
| 3 | Promote an idea even if it is likely to generate harsh opposition. |  |
| 4 | Appreciate solutions that are out of the norm. |  |
| 5 | An unusual solution to a problem does not make me uncomfortable. |  |
| 6 | Am not deterred by a high-risk, high-reward solution to a problem. |  |
| 7 | Lead those interested in brainstorming new, creative solutions to identified needs. |  |
| 8 | Consider novel approaches to solving long-standing problems. |  |
| 9 | Argue to try novel solution even if currently unproven. |  |
| 10 | Become bored with tried and true solution. |  |
|  | Total Domain Score |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **PROMOTER DOMAIN** |
| Group | Statement | Score |
| 1 | Request support from administrative officials for upcoming proposal support. |  |
| 2 | Create and input grantor search profile into the appropriate grantor database. |  |
| 3 | Prepare a draft of your proposal using instructions and previously funded proposals. |  |
| 4 | Make pre-proposal contact with funding officials. |  |
| 5 | Develop plans for conferences, presentations, and the writing of related articles. |  |
| 6 | Develop a prioritized list of potential strategies using values voting. |  |
| 7 | Pull the team together to review the project planner and re-commit to the action steps. |  |
| 8 | Research backgrounds of those who will read and evaluate proposals. |  |
| 9 | Identify members of the team most likely to prepare a winning grant. |  |
| 10 | Create a plan for resubmitting failed proposal. |  |
|  | Total Domain Score |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **IMPLEMENTER/MANAGER DOMAIN** |
| Group | Statement | Score |
| 1 | Coordinate proposal sign-off to ensure timely submission and format. |  |
| 2 | Establish team rules (e.g., attendance, meeting dates and times, team leadership, etc.). |  |
| 3 | Complete a spreadsheet (project planner) that details project tasks and costs. |  |
| 4 | Provide logistics for grant team meetings. |  |
| 5 | If awarded, document expenditure of funds and maximize their use. |  |
| 6 | Draft a budget from the project planner spreadsheet.  |  |
| 7 | Organize and conduct a team meeting after receiving the notice of award or rejection to determine the next steps. |  |
| 8 | Review procedures for hiring grant staff with Human Resources. |  |
| 9 | Record the ideas/suggestions for closing the gap. |  |
| 10 | Develop a plan for grantor site visits. |  |
|  | Total Domain Score |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **ANALYST DOMAIN** |
| Group | Statement | Score |
| 1 | Develop a list of key search terms related to the problem area. |  |
| 2 | Identify prospective grantors to determine a best match to current proposal. |  |
| 3 | Research the scoring rubric/criteria to be used in evaluating your proposal. |  |
| 4 | Develop an evaluation design for a project. |  |
| 5 | Evaluate the fundability of your proposal by reviewing funded proposals. |  |
| 6 | Develop 1-page concept papers for the most fundable proposals. |  |
| 7 | Develop an advisory committee of experts to provide feedback and insights. |  |
| 8 | Prepare a brief summary of the literature that documents the problem. |  |
| 9 | Organize and conduct a quality circle/mock review in a timely manner. |  |
| 10 | Update the relevant literature search. |  |
|  | Total Domain Score |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SCORE** | **DOMAIN (Circle One)** |
| Highest Domain Score |  | Originator Promoter Impl./Manager Analyst |
| Second Highest Domain Score |  | Originator Promoter Impl./Manager Analyst |
| Third Highest Domain Score |  | Originator Promoter Impl./Manager Analyst |
| Lowest Domain Score |  | Originator Promoter Impl./Manager Analyst |

Interpretation

Anyone whose score is positive in a domain would feel comfortable operating in that domain. However, the higher the score is, the more one’s skills and preferences fall within that domain. If one score is considerably higher than the others, one might want to restrict him or herself to that domain. If the two or three highest scores are similar and positive, the individual should be comfortable in those domains. Should an individual have a negative score in a domain, that person would probably not prefer to operate in that domain and the team would probably benefit from him or her not doing so. Please note that these scores are intended to provide guidance to maximize team effectiveness by guiding us to tasks that we feel most suited to perform.