WILLIAM T. GRANT SCHOLARS PROGRAM

Supporting research to improve the lives of young people

APPLICATION GUIDE

Application Deadline July 8, 2013
Announcement of Awards March 2014
Supporting Researchers, Facilitating Mentorships, Expanding Expertise
The William T. Grant Scholars Program is for early-career researchers in the social, behavioral, and health sciences. The goal of the program is to support the development of Scholars as they expand their skills and conduct high-quality research with mentoring from senior colleagues.

We encourage Scholars to be ambitious in their research by tackling important questions that will advance theory, policy, and practice for youth. Applicants identify new methods, disciplines, or content they want to learn, and propose five-year research plans that require them to gain new skills in those areas. We recognize that early-career researchers are rarely given incentives or support to take such risks, so this award includes a mentoring component. Applicants create mentoring plans—identifying appropriate senior colleagues in the area of proposed development—to aid in acquiring new expertise and producing stronger work.

Potential Scholars should have a promising track record of conducting high-quality research, but want to pursue a qualitative shift in their trajectories as researchers. Successful Scholars have designed plans that enriched their work and the strength and relevance of their findings. A quantitative researcher gained skills in qualitative work and began using a mixed-methods approach. And, a sociologist with expertise in community-based organizations learned about youth development in order to study how such organizations serve children and adolescents.
CURRENT RESEARCH INTERESTS

Proposed research plans must fit the Foundation’s research interests. We currently support research to understand and improve the everyday settings of youth ages 8 to 25 in the United States. Specifically, we fund studies that enhance understanding of:

- How youth settings work, how they affect youth development, and how they can be improved; and
- When, how, and under what conditions research evidence is used in policy and practice that affect youth, and how its use can be improved.

The Foundation’s Senior Program Team has written a series of essays for our Annual Reports in which we describe our research interests in more depth, including the types of studies we support and our grantees’ work. We encourage applicants to review these essays. In addition, we have statements detailing our interests in intervention research, measurement development, policy, practice, and the interplay of biological and social processes. All this information is available on our website, as are additional resources (e.g., reference lists, tools, publications, presentations, lists of funded grants) related to our interests.
FORMER SCHOLAR
KATHRYN GRANT, PH.D.
Professor, Clinical Child Psychology, DePaul University

My Scholars award, “Stress and the Emergence of Psychological Symptoms Among Low-Income Urban Youth,” changed the trajectory of my career in many ways. Before I received the award, I had not been involved in intervention research but had hoped that someday I would use findings to actually influence the lives of the youth I studied. The Scholars award helped me accomplish that.

During the grant, I used rich mixed methods to collect longitudinal data, which highlighted processes amenable to change. For example, qualitative and quantitative evidence showed that individually based coping strategies made things worse for low-income urban youth exposed to severe and chronic stressors, unless youth used these strategies in the context of supportive relationships with adults and protective settings.

My mentors used research to design effective prevention and intervention programs and trained me to do that myself. As a result, I was able to secure additional funding to develop preventive interventions that build upon the findings from my Scholars work. In particular, with funding from the U.S. Department of Education, I am collaborating on the development of a prevention program that teaches low-income urban youth coping strategies in the context of mentoring relationships and protective settings. Another project, funded by the National Institute of Mental Health, involves developing a coping program for mothers and daughters.

The Scholars award also helped me develop a big picture model for conducting iterative research that not only uses research to inform practice but also uses practice to inform the research questions. For example, some of our intervention development work raised questions about stress effects on learning that may mediate long-term health and academic outcomes. So, with support from the National Institutes of Health Basic Behavior and Social Science Opportunity Network, my collaborators and I are conducting a new study of cognitive, affective, and physiological mediators of stress effects on mental and physical health and academic achievement. In keeping with lessons learned from the William T. Grant Foundation, we have designed this study to provide data that will inform future intervention efforts and influence the specific interventions we have already begun to develop.

The Scholars Program laid the foundation for each of the studies I am currently conducting and, more importantly, informed the iterative way in which the studies build upon one another. This award placed my research on a new trajectory with much more potential to positively affect the lives of young people.
IMPLICATIONS FOR APPLICANTS

Studies focused on youth settings should have strong theory and measures. We encourage studies that contribute to theories of how settings work, how to improve them, and how they affect youth. Like others in the field, Foundation staff and grantees are exploring the idea that settings are dynamic systems with certain social processes, resources, and ways of organizing those resources. We seek to more fully understand the social processes in settings that influence youth development. Social processes include interactions between teachers and students, staff and youth, caregivers and children, and peers. They also include relationships, social norms, and social and instructional activities. Time, people, money, and materials are important resources in settings, and we are interested in how the presence and allocation of those resources affect social processes and ultimately youth development. Measurement plans should strongly reflect the study’s main questions and include rigorous methods for assessing key aspects of settings. The strongest measurement plans incorporate setting data from several sources.

SETTINGS DEFINED
We define settings as the social environments in which youth experience daily life. These include environments with clear boundaries such as classrooms, schools, and youth-serving organizations as well as those with less prescribed boundaries such as neighborhoods, families, or peer groups. At their best, these settings embed youth within a network of engaging activities; ample resources; meaningful relationships; and opportunities for academic, social, emotional, and identity development.

Studies of research use should build theory and employ strong methods to increase understanding of policymakers’ and practitioners’ acquisition, interpretation, or use of research evidence. We are interested in understanding how organizational and institutional factors, intermediary organizations, and social networks influence the acquisition of research evidence. Policymakers, program managers, and administrators often interpret and use research in conjunction with other information (e.g., administrative data, prior experience, practitioner knowledge) and considerations (e.g., values, fiscal constraints, political context), and we seek to increase understanding of how research is integrated with other types of evidence. We are open to studies of the various ways research evidence is used. This includes instrumental use wherein research evidence is directly applied to decision-making; conceptual use wherein research evidence influences how policymakers and practitioners think about issues, problems, or potential solutions; tactical use in which research evidence is used to justify existing positions, such as supporting a piece of legislation or challenging a reform effort; and imposed use in which there are mandates to use research evidence, such as when government funding requires that agencies adopt programs backed by evidence of effectiveness.
ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Applicants must be nominated by their institutions. Major divisions (e.g., College of Arts and Sciences, Medical School) of an institution may nominate only one applicant each year. In addition to the eligibility criteria below, deans and directors of those divisions should refer to the Selection Criteria on page 9 to aid them in choosing their nominees.

- Applicants must have received their terminal degree within seven years of submitting their application. We calculate this by adding seven years to the date the doctoral degree was conferred. In medicine, the seven-year maximum is dated from the completion of the first residency.
- Applicants must be employed in career-ladder positions. For many applicants, this means holding a tenure-track position in a university. Applicants in other types of organizations should be in positions in which there is a pathway to advancement in a research career at the organization and the organization is fiscally responsible for the applicant’s position. The award may not be used as a post-doctoral fellowship.
- Applicants outside the United States are eligible. As with U.S. applicants, they must pursue research that has compelling policy or practice implications for the settings of youth ages 8 to 25 in the United States.
- Applicants of any discipline are eligible.

ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS

Grants are made to organizations or institutions, not individuals. Grants are limited, without exception, to tax-exempt entities for purposes that are described in Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Applying institutions must make available, on request, letters from the Internal Revenue Service that include the applicant’s classification under Section 509(a) of the Code, “Private Foundation Status.”

AWARDS

Award recipients are designated William T. Grant Scholars. Each year, four to six Scholars are selected and each receives $350,000, distributed over five years. Awards begin July 1 and are made to the applicant’s institution. The award must not replace the institution’s current support of the applicant’s research.
FORMER SCHOLAR
HIROKAzu YOSHIKAWA. PH.D.
Walter H. Gale Professor of
Education & Academic Dean
Harvard Graduate School of Education

The Scholars award that I received, “Anti-Poverty Policy, Cultural Variation, and Survival Strategies of Young Mothers: Quantitative and Ethnographic Approaches,” allowed me to move into a new and challenging area of qualitative research—participant observation and ethnography—and integrate that work with the quantitative research I’d been doing.

I’d had experience with focus groups and semi-structured interviews prior to my Scholars award. Full-scale ethnography is, however, a very different animal, with epistemological, data collection, and analytic challenges. The ethnography I ultimately conducted with the support of this award was a two and a half-year longitudinal study embedded in a larger quantitative study, focused on the experiences of survival strategies, hardship, and parenting among a sample of Mexican, Dominican, and Chinese immigrant mothers and U.S.-born African American mothers.

As is often the case in qualitative research, the proposed work went in unexpected directions. A powerful theme emerged in a surprising way from the data—the potential role that parents’ undocumented status played in the daily routines, household life, and child development of the sample. It turned out that there had not been a large-scale study examining how parents’ undocumented status might affect their children’s development. The resulting analyses culminated in my first sole-authored book, *Immigrants Raising Citizens: Undocumented Parents and Their Young Children*. The book combined the ethnographic data with longitudinal survey and child assessment data to delineate the particularly harmful consequences that growing up with a parent without papers has on children’s cognitive development. The Scholars award fulfilled its purpose of stretching my work in new, unpredictable, and fulfilling directions.

With my mentor in qualitative methods, Thomas Weisner, and a rich set of collaborators including Ajay Chaudry and Niobe Way, I had the support I needed to conduct an unprecedented, multilingual, comparative qualitative study across the neighborhoods of New York City. In the process, I learned an extraordinary amount about the daily routines, struggles, and successes of newcomer families and how they managed to make ends meet in one of the most expensive and diverse cities in North America.
CAPACITY-BUILDING SUPPORT

The Foundation holds annual meetings during the summer to support the Scholars' professional development. The summer retreats are designed to foster a supportive environment in which Scholars can improve their skills and work. Scholars discuss work-in-progress and receive constructive feedback on the challenges and dilemmas they face in conducting their projects. The retreat consists of workshops centered on Scholars' projects, research design and methods issues, and professional development. The meeting is attended by Scholars, Scholars Selection Committee members, and Foundation staff and Board members. Scholars are also invited to attend other Foundation-sponsored workshops on topics relevant to their work, such as mixed methods and the use of research evidence in policy and practice.

In years one through three of their awards, Scholars may apply for additional awards to mentor junior researchers of color. The announcement and criteria for funding are distributed annually to Scholars. Our goals for these two-year awards are to build Scholars' mentoring skills and understanding of the career development issues faced by junior colleagues of color. We also seek to expand their mentees' research assets and increase the number of strong, well-networked researchers of color doing work on the Foundation's research interests. The Foundation convenes annual workshops to strengthen these mentoring relationships and support career development.

POST-AWARD REVIEW

Annual program and financial reports are required from Scholars and their institutions. Final reports are due at the end of the award. Scholars' mentors also complete annual and final reports. Annual program reports describe work during the past year and facilitate the Foundation's grants management activities. Grants are assigned for post-award review to a member of the Foundation's Senior Program Team: Robert C. Granger, president; Vivian Tseng, vice president, program; Kimberly DuMont, program officer; and Edward Seidman, Thomas Weisner, or Brian Wilcox, senior program associates. Senior Program Team members review program reports in order to: (1) find opportunities to link grantees to other scholars, policymakers, and practitioners working in relevant areas; (2) provide technical assistance, advice, or other resources to support the work; and (3) assist grantees with communication and dissemination efforts.
RESTRICTIONS
The Scholars awards are for career development, and it is understood that research and mentoring plans may benefit from adjustments after the awards are made. Before making such modifications, the Scholar must discuss proposed changes with the Senior Program Team reviewer assigned to his or her grant. Without such prior approval, the Foundation reserves the right to terminate the award when the research changes from that originally proposed.

The Foundation’s approval is also required if the Scholar wants to transfer the award to another institution. Approval for transfer will depend on the ability of the Scholar to carry out the work within the new setting. The new institution must submit materials documenting its agreement with all terms and conditions of the award.
SELECTION CRITERIA

Selection is based on applicants’ promise for becoming influential researchers, as well as their plans to expand their expertise in new and significant ways. The application should make a cohesive argument for how the applicant will expand his or her expertise. The research plan should evolve in conjunction with the development of new expertise, and the mentoring plan should describe how the proposed mentors will support applicants in acquiring that expertise.

APPLICANT

a) Applicant demonstrates promise for becoming an influential researcher. An ability to conduct and communicate creative, sophisticated research is proven through prior training and publications. Competitive applicants have a promising track record of first authored, high-quality empirical publications in peer-reviewed outlets. The quality of publications is more important than the quantity.

b) Applicant will significantly expand his or her expertise through this award. The applicant should identify area(s) in which the award will appreciably expand his or her expertise, and the research and mentoring plans should strongly reflect that. This can include developing expertise in a different discipline, method, and/or content area.

RESEARCH PLAN

a) Research area is consistent with Foundation’s Current Research Interests. See the Foundation’s website for a statement of our Current Research Interests and Annual Report essays which explain these interests in greater detail.

b) Research questions have relevance for policies and/or practices affecting the settings of youth ages 8 to 25 in the United States or a vulnerable subpopulation of those youth (e.g., young people who are adjudicated or aging out of foster care). Some funded studies directly examine policies, programs, and services. Others advance understanding of how youth settings work in ways that inform policy or program efforts to improve those settings. The Foundation does not expect that any one study will or should impact policy or practice. Instead, studies should contribute to a body of empirical evidence that is relevant to policy or practice.

c) Research plan informs theory and extends prior and concurrent work. The application reflects a mastery of related theory and empirical findings and builds upon this prior work. Studies can focus on either generating or testing theory (depending on the state of current knowledge) about how youth settings work, how to improve them, and how they affect youth. Studies can also build or test theories about the use of research evidence in policy and practice affecting youth.
d) **Research plan reflects high standards of evidence and rigorous methods, commensurate with the proposal's goals.** The latter years or projects of the research plan may, by necessity, be described in less detail than those of the first few, but successful applicants provide enough specificity for reviewers to be assured of the rigor and feasibility of the plan.
- Research designs, methods, and analysis plans clearly fit the research questions under study.
- Samples are appropriate in size and composition to address the research questions.
- Assessments, observations, and/or measurements reflect methodological rigor.
- Analysis plans for quantitative and/or qualitative data reflect sufficient sophistication for addressing the research questions.
- Plan reflects a clear understanding of the strengths and limits of various research designs, methods, and analytic techniques.
- Where relevant, there is attention to generalizability of findings and to statistical power to detect meaningful effects.

e) **Research plan demonstrates adequate consideration of the gender, ethnic, and cultural appropriateness of concepts, methods, and measures.**

f) **Research plan is feasible.** The work can be successfully completed given the resources and time frame. Some research plans require additional funding, and in those cases, applicants have viable plans for acquiring that support.

g) **Research plan is cohesive and multiple studies (if proposed) are well-integrated.**

h) **Research plan will significantly extend the applicant's expertise in new and significant ways.**
MENTORING PLAN

a) Applicant proposes one to two mentors for the first two years of the award. (The mentoring plan for the latter years will be developed in consultation with Foundation staff after the second year of the program.) Applicant and each mentor identify and agree on specific goals for their mentoring relationship.

b) Proposed mentor has appropriate credentials, expertise, and resources to aid the applicant’s acquisition of the new expertise; has a strong track record of mentorship; and demonstrates a commitment to mentoring the applicant.

c) Mentoring plan convincingly details how the proposed mentor will aid the applicant in acquiring the new expertise. Plan includes appropriate activities, interactions, and time to meet the mentoring goals. For example, mentoring on new methods may require different strategies than on new disciplinary perspectives.

d) Award will add significant value to each mentoring relationship beyond what would normally occur.

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

a) The supporting institution nominates the applicant. Each year, only one applicant may be nominated from a major division (e.g., College of Arts and Sciences, Medical School) of an institution.

b) The institution is committed to providing the researcher with sufficient resources to carry out the five-year research plan. This includes computer equipment, colleagues, administrative staff, research facilities, and the balance of his or her salary, absent denial of tenure or dramatic reduction in institutional funding. At least half of the Scholar’s paid time must be spent conducting research.
APPLICATION PROCESS & REQUIRED MATERIALS

Submit applications via our website at www.wtgrantfoundation.org. All documents must be submitted by 3:00 p.m. EST on July 8, 2013.

We strongly recommend beginning the online application by early June, in order to trigger the system’s automatic emails to your references and proposed mentors. Applicants should go to our website and follow these steps:

1. Click on the Login button on the top right of any page, and enter your Login ID and password. New users must register to obtain login information before they can proceed.
2. You will be directed to your homepage. On your homepage, select “Click here to start a new application.”
   • Select appropriate funding opportunity: William T. Grant Scholars 2013–14.
   • Take the eligibility quiz for William T. Grant Scholars.
   • After saving this information, you will be brought back to your homepage.
   • Under “To Do—Application,” select “William T. Grant Scholars Application.”
3. You can access the application from your homepage at any time. You may complete the sections of the application in any order. You do not need to complete the application in one session, and can revisit it as often as needed until you are ready to submit.

CONTACT INFORMATION
Fill in all required information.

MENTOR AND REFERENCE LETTERS
By beginning the online application early, applicants can give mentors and references ample time to complete their sections. Applicants should select “Notify” in the mentors and references section of the online application to have the system email instructions to their mentors and references. We also advise applicants to inform their mentors and references to be aware that these emails may get caught by spam filters. You may work on other sections of the application while waiting for your mentors and references to submit their letters, but you will not be able to submit your application until all letters are received.

Mentors. Applicants should propose one to two mentors for the first two years of the mentoring plan (please refer to the Foundation’s Selection Criteria on page 9).
Each proposed mentor should submit a letter. Mentor letters are not recommendations. Applicants should discourage cursory letters of support that do not spell out the mentor’s commitment and the specifics of the mentorship. The letter should include:

- A brief assessment of the applicant’s research plan, and a summation of the applicant’s potential, his or her strengths, and areas for growth;
- His or her current relationship to the applicant, and how the award will add significant value beyond what would normally occur in the relationship;
- Confirmation of his or her willingness to complete annual reports for the award (mentors receive an honorarium of $500 upon receipt of reports); and
- An explanation of the expertise the mentor will help the applicant acquire, and a description of his or her proposed role in the mentoring plan, which is developed jointly with the applicant. The mentor should detail mentoring activities that will aid the applicant’s acquisition of the new expertise and develop his or her research career. Consider the types of activities and time commitments needed to successfully help someone develop particular kinds of expertise. Activities generally include direct interactions with applicants, but can also include indirect support such as facilitating access to new professional networks, readings, or training opportunities. Describe how the mentor and applicant will interact (i.e., in-person, email, phone), the frequency of that interaction, and how potential barriers such as distance and busy schedules will be addressed.

**References.** Three letters of recommendation should be submitted from colleagues, supervisors, or the department/division chairperson who nominates the applicant. Proposed mentors may not submit these.

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

Fill in the required information.

**BUDGET AND BUDGET JUSTIFICATION**

Provide budget information for five years using the Foundation’s Budget and Budget Justification forms, which are available on the website. The total budget must be exactly $350,000. It can include an indirect cost allowance of no more than 7.5 percent of total direct costs. Requests to fund recipient’s salary must not exceed 50 percent of the total salary received from the sponsoring institution. The portion of the grant used for salary must be equivalent to the time made available for research by this award. The remainder of funds may be used to support research-related work. (The Foundation pays expenses related to the Scholars’ participation in Foundation-sponsored meetings.)
The mentoring plan must meet the Selection Criteria (see page 9). Applicants should describe a systematic plan, developed with input from mentors, that (1) describes current skills and those that will be added during the award, and (2) justifies the need for further career development. For the first two years of the plan, applicants should explain the expertise to be acquired; specify one to two mentors; and describe the rationale for choosing each mentor, the applicant's current relationship with each, and how the award would add significant value beyond what would normally occur. The plan should include detailed descriptions of the following:

- the mentoring activities designed to develop the new expertise;
- the mentor's role in providing guidance and access to resources and opportunities;
- how the applicant and mentor will interact (i.e., in-person, email, phone), how often, and how potential barriers such as distance and busy schedules will be addressed; and
- the types of activities and time commitments needed to successfully acquire particular kinds of expertise (e.g., learning new methods likely requires different activities than learning new disciplinary perspectives).

Activities generally include mentors' direct interactions with applicants, but can also include support such as facilitating access to new professional networks, readings, or training opportunities.

The Foundation is committed to helping Scholars navigate their way through successful mentoring relationships. The following resources may aid applicants in creating strong mentoring plans:

- Maximizing Mentoring: A Guide for Building Stronger Relationships
- Pay It Forward: Guidance for Mentoring Junior Scholars. The latter was developed to help Scholars become stronger mentors, but it may also provide insights on being mentored.

Plans should also include:

- Bibliography (10 pages maximum)
- Appendices (10 pages maximum)

UPLOADES
All uploaded documents should:
- use a font no smaller than 12 pt.;
- have margins of at least one inch on all sides;
- be single-spaced, with two lines between paragraphs; and
- be in .doc, .docx, .rtf, or .pdf format.

Please adhere to the page limits specified below. Files can only be uploaded one at a time. They may be uploaded in any order; the final application PDF will sort the uploads as they are listed below.

Budget Justification, using the Foundation’s form on the website.

Abridged Curriculum Vitae, using the Foundation’s form on the website.

Full Curriculum Vitae

Abstract, using the Foundation’s form on the website (6 pages maximum). Do not edit the form or delete instructions from it. Abstracts are a critical part of the application, and Foundation staff use them to screen applications. In addition, Selection Committee members will review the abstracts of all finalists, but will not read all the full applications. We advise applicants to include sufficient details about the research sample, methods, and designs for all reviewers to be assured of the quality of the proposed research.

Full Research and Mentoring Plan (40 pages maximum)

Research and Mentoring Plans (20 pages maximum). The five-year research plan should include one or more research projects and provide convincing evidence that the projects meet the Selection Criteria (see page 9). The primary (or first) research project should be described in greatest detail. The description should include:

- the unique contribution of the research,
- its significance in terms of policy and/or practice,
- a brief literature review,
- research design and methodology,
- data sources and collection procedures,
- data analysis plans, and
- plans for protection of human subjects.

The latter projects or years of the research plan may, by necessity, be described in less detail than the early ones. However, the most competitive applications provide sufficient specificity for reviewers to be assured of the plan's rigor and feasibility. The entire plan should describe how the research will evolve in conjunction with the applicant’s development of new expertise.
The mentoring plan must meet the Selection Criteria (see page 9). Applicants should describe a systematic plan, developed with input from mentors, that (1) describes current skills and those that will be added during the award, and (2) justifies the need for further career development. For the first two years of the plan, applicants should explain the expertise to be acquired; specify one to two mentors; and describe the rationale for choosing each mentor, the applicant’s current relationship with each, and how the award would add significant value beyond what would normally occur. The plan should include detailed descriptions of the following:

- the mentoring activities designed to develop the new expertise;
- the mentor’s role in providing guidance and access to resources and opportunities;
- how the applicant and mentor will interact (i.e., in-person, email, phone), how often, and how potential barriers such as distance and busy schedules will be addressed; and
- the types of activities and time commitments needed to successfully acquire particular kinds of expertise (e.g., learning new methods likely requires different activities than learning new disciplinary perspectives). Activities generally include mentors’ direct interactions with applicants, but can also include support such as facilitating access to new professional networks, readings, or training opportunities.

The Foundation is committed to helping Scholars navigate their way through successful mentoring relationships. The following resources may aid applicants in creating strong mentoring plans: Maximizing Mentoring: A Guide for Building Stronger Relationships and Pay It Forward: Guidance for Mentoring Junior Scholars. The latter was developed to help Scholars become stronger mentors, but it may also provide insights on being mentored.

Plans should also include:

- Bibliography (10 pages maximum)
- Appendices (10 pages maximum)
Publication 1 (15 pages maximum). This should be a journal article, chapter, or research report that exemplifies the applicant’s research. Ideally, the publication is relevant to the proposed research. We prefer publications that have already been published or are in press, though some applicants choose to submit work that is directly relevant to the proposed research, but is still under review.

Publication 2. Same requirements as Publication 1.

Nominating Statement. This statement from the chairperson of the nominating division should describe why the applicant was selected; an assessment of the applicant’s plan; the applicant’s current and expected future roles in the division; the supporting resources available; the applicant’s current source and amount of salary; and the appointment, promotion, and institutional support plans for the applicant, including a guarantee that 50 percent of the applicant’s paid time will be devoted to research.

Endorsement of Project. This document should come from the appropriate institutional office and personnel (e.g., Office of Sponsored Research, chief administrative officer), contain general information about the applicant, and confirm that the institution is aware the applicant is submitting the proposal.

Letter of Independence of Multiple Applicants (if applicable). If an institution nominates more than one applicant, a central administrative officer must submit confirmation that the applicants represent distinct schools or major divisions (e.g., College of Arts and Sciences, Medical School, major division of a nonprofit) of the institution.
Resubmission Statement (if applicable). Applicants who have applied previously should describe their response to reviewer comments on the prior application and the major ways this application differs from the prior one.

501(c)(3) Tax-Exempt Letter from the IRS for your institution.

Supporting letters (if applicable). Applicants can upload letters of support from agencies participating in the research.

Review and Submit
After you complete your uploads, proceed to the Review and Submit section. We recommend that you open the final application document and review it carefully—once submitted, it cannot be changed. After reviewing the document, hit the Submit button to complete your application. An automatic email confirmation will be sent to you.

Application Review
Review occurs in the following stages: Staff screen abstracts, brief CVs, and, if warranted, full applications to determine whether they fit our Current Research Interests and potentially meet other Selection Criteria. Next, the Scholars Selection Committee reviews the remaining applications. Each application receives detailed reviews by two Committee members. The Committee then chooses approximately 10 finalists, who are invited to New York City for an interview on February 7, 2014. Prior to the interview, finalists’ proposals are reviewed by two external reviewers. During the interview, finalists have the opportunity to respond to Committee members’ and external experts’ reviews. Following the interviews, the Selection Committee chooses four to six William T. Grant Scholars. Applicants will be notified of the Committee’s decision by the end of March 2014.
WILLIAM T. GRANT SCHOLARS SELECTION

Cynthia García Coll, Ph.D., Chair
Robinson and Barstow Professor of Education, Psychology, and Pediatrics
Brown University

W. Thomas Boyce, M.D.
Sunny Hill Health Center-BC Leadership Chair in Child Development
Professor, Interdisciplinary Studies and Pediatrics
University of British Columbia

Robert C. Granger, Ed.D.
President, William T. Grant Foundation

Susan M. Kegeles, Ph.D.
Professor of Medicine
Co-Director, Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
University of California, San Francisco

Vonnie C. McLoyd, Ph.D.
Ewart A.C. Thomas Collegiate Professor
Developmental Area Chair
Department of Psychology
University of Michigan

Elizabeth Birr Moje, Ph.D.
Arthur F. Thurnau Professor
Associate Dean for Research
School of Education
Faculty Associate, Institute for Social Research
Faculty Affiliate, Latino/a Studies
University of Michigan

Richard J. Murnane, Ph.D.
Juliana W. and William Foss Thompson Professor of Education and Society
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
Lawrence Palinkas, Ph.D.
Albert G. and Frances Lomas Feldman
Professor of Social Policy and Health
School of Social Work
University of Southern California

Mary Pattillo, Ph.D.
Harold Washington Professor of Sociology and
African American Studies
Faculty Affiliate, Institute for Policy Research
Northwestern University

Robert C. Pianta, Ph.D.
Dean, Curry School of Education
Novartis Professor of Education
Founding Director, Center for Advanced Study
of Teaching and Learning
Director, National Center for Research in Early
Childhood Education
University of Virginia

Andrew C. Porter, Ph.D.
Dean, Graduate School of Education
George and Diane Weiss Professor of Education
University of Pennsylvania

Jane Waldfogel, Ph.D.
Compton Foundation Centennial Professor of
Social Work and Public Affairs
Columbia University

Hirokazu Yoshikawa, Ph.D.
Academic Dean and
Walter H. Gale Professor of Education
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

Standing, front left: Jane Waldfogel, Hirokazu Yoshikawa,
Elizabeth Birr Moje, Robert C. Pianta,
W. Thomas Boyce, Robert C. Granger, Lawrence Palinkas,
Vonnie C. McLloyd, and Andrew C. Porter.
Seated, from left: Mary Pattillo, Timothy Smeeding*,
Richard J. Murnane, and Cynthia Garcia Coll.
Not pictured: Susan M. Kegeles.
*Retired from Committee
Renee Boynton-Jarrett, M.D., Sc.D.
Assistant Professor of Pediatrics
Boston University School of Medicine
*The Social Ecology of Adolescent Obesity: Defining the Role of Adverse Social Settings and Social Stress*

Stefanie DeLuca, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
Johns Hopkins University
*Moving Matters: Residential Mobility, Neighborhoods, and Family in the Lives of Poor Adolescents*

Alisa Hicklin Fryar, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Oklahoma
*Minority Student Success in Higher Education*

Brian Mustanski, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Director of the IMPACT LGBT Health and Development Program
Department of Medical Social Sciences
Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine
*The Internet as a Setting for Sexual Health Development Among Gay Youth*
CLASS OF 2014

Guanglei Hong, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Comparative Human Development
University of Chicago
*Causal Inference Methods for Studying Instruction Effects on Language Minority Students*

Derek Kreager, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology and Crime, Law and Justice
Pennsylvania State University
*Peer Networks and Adolescent Sexual Development*

Candice L. Odgers, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Associate Director, Center for Child and Family Policy
Sanford School of Public Policy
Duke University
*Macro-to-Micro Contextual Triggers of Early Adolescent Substance Exposure*

Craig Schwalbe, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
School of Social Work
Columbia University
*Social Processes in Juvenile Probation*
CLASS OF 2015

Elizabeth Oltmans Ananat, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Sanford School of Public Policy
Duke University
Economic and Social Determinants of the Educational, Occupational, and Residential Choices of Young Adults

Phillip Atiba Goff, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
University of California, Los Angeles
Broken Windows, Broken Youth: The Effect of Law Enforcement on Non-White Males’ Development

Sara Goldrick-Rab, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Rethinking College Choice in America

Patrick Sharkey, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
New York University
The Impact of Acute Violence and Other Environmental Stressors on Cognitive Functioning and School Performance

Left to right: Sara Goldrick-Rab, Patrick Sharkey, Elizabeth Oltmans Ananat. Not pictured: Phillip Atiba Goff
CLASS OF 2016

Joshua L. Brown, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
Fordham University
The Impact of School and Classroom Environments on Youth Mental Health: Moderation by Genetic Polymorphisms

Amanda E. Guyer, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Human and Community Development
Center for Mind and Brain
University of California, Davis
Social Settings as a Context for Neurobiological Sensitivity in Adolescence

Elizabeth Levy Paluck, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
Princeton University
Creating Tolerant School Settings: A Proposal for a Social Networks-based Field Experimental Intervention

Dallas Swendeman, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Executive Director
Center for HIV Identification, Prevention, and Treatment Services (CHIPTS)
University of California, Los Angeles
Mobile Phone Ecological Momentary Assessment for Family Functioning, Daily Routines, and Settings

Bic Ngo, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Minnesota
Innovating Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: Insights from Arts Programs Serving Immigrant Youth

Left to right: Dallas Swendeman, Bic Ngo, Elizabeth Levy Paluck, Amanda E. Guyer, Joshua L. Brown,
CLASS OF 2017

Jason Fletcher, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Health Policy and Management
Yale University
Interconnected Contexts: The Interplay Between Genetics and Social Settings in Youth Development

Micere Keels, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Comparative Human Development
Faculty Affiliate, Center for the Study of Race, Politics and Culture
University of Chicago
Consequences of the Within-Race/Ethnicity Gender Imbalance in the College Campus Setting

Tamara G.J. Leech, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Sociology Department
Director, Survey Research Center
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Pockets of Peace: Investigating Urban Neighborhoods Resilient to Adolescent Violence

Jelena Obradović, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Graduate School of Education
Project Director, Stanford Project on Adaptation and Resilience in Kids (SPARK)
Stanford University
Executive Functions and Biological Sensitivity in Classroom Settings

Monica Tsethlikai, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
University of Utah
An Examination of Cultural and Cognitive Processes Facilitating Positive Youth Development in American Indian Communities

Tuppett Yates, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Director, Adversity and Adaptation Lab
Department of Psychology
University of California, Riverside
Settings for Success Among Emancipating Foster Youth: Youth and Workers in Communication and Collaboration

Left to right: Tamara G.J. Leech, Jelena Obradovic, Micere Keels, Jason Fletcher Tuppett Yates, Monica Tsethlikai.