DANA FOUNDATION REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Planning Grants for future Dana Centers for Neuroscience & Society

THE OPPORTUNITY

The Dana Foundation is seeking US-based strategic partners to design and host a Center for Neurscience & Society, one that is deeply committed to rigorous interdisciplinary training in neuroscience, engages in research with an eye towards addressing practical issues raised by advancing neuroscience, and grows a new generation of interdisciplinary experts who are empowered to embed neuroscience and its implications in a societal context.

The Foundation is requesting proposals for five-month planning grants designed to assist grantees in developing a detailed plan for a potential Dana Center for Neuroscience & Society. Grantees will receive up to $150,000 to create a vision for a center, organize and gather expertise, outline potential programs, and pilot-test a potential model for training and/or education. Proposals for planning grants are due July 6, 2022, with a start date as early as October 1, 2022.

The planning grant is the first step in a two-step process. Recipients of planning grants will have the opportunity to submit a proposal to be considered as a candidate to host a Dana Center. Proposals for a Dana Center will be due in mid-2023. We anticipate a Dana Center will be announced in late 2023. Dana Centers will be funded at approximately $1M annually for five years.

Successful applicants will have a clear vision and ability to execute according to the criteria outlined below. In addition, applicants must demonstrate strong institutional commitment to the Center through an institutional matching contribution that is materially significant to the host college or university, at least a 50-percent match of the funds provided by Dana to the Center. This may include in-kind contributions.

THE NEED

Over the past 30 years, neuroscience has shifted from an emerging field of inquiry into a major funding priority for large-scale national programs like the National Institutes of Health's BRAIN Initiative. At the heart of these investments is both a desire to understand the brain—and, fundamentally, ourselves—and to turn the tide on the devastating impact of the hundreds of brain-based conditions that afflict humankind. Neuroscience, however, cannot be separated from the broader societies in which it is conducted: "Neuroscientific activities and outputs are value-laden, they reflect the cultural, ethical, and political values that are prioritized in different societies at a given time and impact a variety of publics beyond the laboratory."[1] We believe that neuroscience would benefit greatly from increased input from diverse stakeholders and potential end users.[2]

1 Das J, Forlini C, Porcello D, Rommelfanger K, Salles A, IBI GN. Neuroscience is Ready for Neuroethics Engagement. Available at SSRN 4052730. 2022 Mar 8.

2 Moss AU, Li ZR, Rommelfanger KS. Assessing the Perceived Value of Neuroethics Questions and Policy to Neuro-Entrepreneurs. Frontiers in neuroscience. 2021:1303.

Bidirectional exchange between neuroscientists and different publics can democratize scientific discovery, enabling participation and building trust. Nevertheless, the ethical, legal, and societal implications of neuroscientific discovery remain underexplored and underfunded.[3] Insufficient attention to these questions may create a neuroscience that reveals marvels about the brain but may have limited connections with people beyond academia, representing a lost opportunity to harness the resources, creativity, and wisdom of lived experience that exist across all communities. This is relevant for all areas of science, but perhaps especially so for neuroscience given the brain's centrality to our understanding of ourselves, our relationships with others, and our broader world.

Neuroscientists, working with scholars in fields such as neuroethics, science and technology studies, and the law, have conducted important work identifying and critiquing various issues raised by advances in neurosciences.[4] A consistent theme that has emerged from this literature is the need for integrating other disciplines, such as ethics, with neuroscience: "[W]ithout ethics integration, neuroscience and neuroscientists might overlook fundamental ethical and social dimensions of the complex phenomena they seek to understand."[5] Nevertheless, there is insufficient evidence of successful transdisciplinary collaboration outside of a few anecdotal examples. Furthermore, much of the early work considering societal implications has focused on speculative technologies rather than questions around how neuroscience is impacting people in the here and now.[6] Finally, despite carefully developed ethical guidelines and recommendations, few have been widely adopted by researchers and innovators. Taken together, there is both a need for and opportunity in reimagining how neuroscience is conducted.

NEUROSCIENCE & SOCIETY

The Dana Foundation's new vision is "brain science for a better future." To accomplish this goal, the Foundation is funding programs under the banner of "Neuroscience & Society," or how neuroscience both informs and reflects society. Neuroscience informing society means that science discovery and technology can create new knowledge, generate solutions to societal issues, improve education, and increase the quality of life. Neuroscience reflecting society means that there is public deliberation on what knowledge is being sought, and how it is used, to create new technologies. This deliberation includes an assessment of the promise and risks associated with adoption and use of neurotechnology and invites public audiences into the process of envisioning and creating new knowledge in neuroscience and new neurotechnologies.

Neuroscience & Society includes fields where neuroscience interfaces with the world beyond biology and medicine, such as ethics, law, humanities, arts, and public engagement. We aim to advance new neuroscience discoveries and technologies in consideration of societal goals and human values. Our goal is to strengthen neuroscience's positive role in the world by advancing people and programs at the intersection of fields, and by advancing public engagement on emerging neuroscience and neurotechnology.

DANA CENTERS

3 Chiong W. Insiders and outsiders: Lessons for neuroethics from the history of bioethics. AJOB neuroscience. 2020 Jul 2;11(3):155-66.
4 Emerging Issues Task Force, International Neuroethics Society. Neuroethics at 15: The current and future environment for neuroethics. AJOB Neuroscience. 2019 Jul 3;10(3):104-10.
5 Presidential Commission for the Study of Bioethical Issues. Gray matters: Integrative approaches for neuroscience, ethics, and society. 2014. Available from: https://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/709231/Gray%20Matters%20Vol%201.pdf?sequence=1
6 Wexler A, Specker Sullivan L. Translational Neuroethics: A Vision for a More Integrated, Inclusive, and Impactful Field. AJOB neuroscience. 2021 Nov 30:1-2.

We aim to grow a new generation of interdisciplinary experts who shepherd neuroscience and neurotechnology uses for a better world. We anticipate supporting training programs and cross-disciplinary collaborative work, and aim to develop a new cadre of future leaders who deeply consider the ethical, legal, and societal implications of neuroscience and neurotechnology.

The Dana Centers for Neuroscience & Society will act as catalytic hubs, spaces where multidisciplinary scholars gather to learn, exchange ideas, and forge collaborations. Interactions should be consistent, organic, and mutually beneficial. The Centers should establish a community where members invite critique but commit to principles such as humility, collaboration, and trust. Center faculty and fellows should engage in multidisciplinary research that furthers the goals of the Foundation.

The Foundation aims to launch a Dana Center in 2023. Each Center will receive a minimum of $1 million per year, with additional funding considered based on expertise, size, and scope. The Foundation will commit to funding the Center for five years, with an option to renew dependent upon outcomes and metrics.

There is no specific requirement for how a Dana Center should be structured. Though we anticipate proposals that envision a traditional academic model, with a Center housed at one institution, we eagerly invite alternative models that can be impactful. This can include, but is not limited to, a central hub with several spokes, multi-institution collaborations, virtual networks, and decentralized partnerships.

DANA CENTER PROGRAM IDEAS

Below is a list of potential programs a Dana Center for Neuroscience & Society may host. Centers need not include any the following programs. Nevertheless, competitive centers will include some of the following types of programs, even if they differ in detail and scope.

Curriculum Development

- Example: Course development in Neuroscience & Society
  - » Could be targeted at undergraduate or graduate audience.
  - » May benefit from offering a practical or case-based component.
  - » Could lead to development of a certificate program.
  - » Sharing curricula with other organizations would align with the principles of open science, which the Dana Foundation supports.

Training

- Example: Dana Fellows program
- Could build a small cohort of postdoctoral fellows working in Neuroscience & Society, with diverse disciplinary backgrounds.
- Example: Professional training programs
  - » Could support tailored programs that offer discipline-based training in Neuroscience & Society such as clinical ethics training, training in law and neuroscience, and social science training for neuroscientists.

Research

- Example: Embedded ethics in a neuroscience or neuroengineering lab
  - » Could support active and on-going rigorous collaboration between neuroscientists/ neuroengineers and Neuroscience & Society scholars.
- Example: Innovation hub
  - » Could facilitate partnership between academic researchers and private sector neurotechnology companies.

PLANNING GRANT DETAILS

Planning grants are designed to provide promising institutions with an opportunity to dedicate time and resources to developing a detailed proposal for a potential Dana Center, while demonstrating suitability to carry out the Foundation's vision for Neuroscience & Society. Proposals for planning grants will be evaluated according to many of the same criteria as proposals for a full Center. The primary difference will be the depth and detail required (see below for comparison of planning grants vs. Center grants). Additionally, planning grants will require conducting a demonstration project, with applicants expected to discuss outcomes and lessons learned in their Center proposal.

Successful grantees for planning grants will receive up to $150k to utilize between October 1, 2022, and February 28, 2023. Grantees will be required to submit a report to the Foundation by March 15, 2023, detailing the work conducted during the five-month grant period. The report will be evaluated by the Foundation to determine viability for a Center hosted at the grantee institution. Based on the reports, the Foundation will invite grantees that have demonstrated a high likelihood of success to submit a full proposal for a Dana Center by mid-2023. From among these proposals, the Foundation will identify finalists that will be reviewed by Dana Foundation's Board of Directors. The Board will select and announce a candidate for a Dana Center in late-2023.

Eligibility

- U.S. accredited institutions of higher education with a campus located in the U.S.
- U.S.-based non-profit organizations

Submission

Please submit all application materials by email to **Ishan Dasgupta** at idasgupta@dana.org by **July 6, 2022, at 11:59 pm Pacific Standard Time**.

Contact Dana Foundation

We encourage applicants to review the FAQ section on our website for more information. Applicants are highly encouraged to contact the Foundation with questions during any part of the process.

Please contact Ishan Dasgupta at idasgupta@dana.org with any inquiries.

KEY DATES

	PLANNING	CENTER
Call for Proposals Open **Candidates for Center proposals will be notified by the Dana Foundation*	May 16, 2022	Spring 2023*
Due date for proposals	July 6, 2022	Mid-2023
Prospective grantees are provided feedback and asked for additional information for Dana Board review	August 1, 2022	Mid-2023
Notification of award	September 15, 2022	Late-2023
Grant start date	October 1, 2022	Late-2023
Virtual site-visits from Dana staff	January 2023	TBD
Grant end date	February 28, 2023	TBD
Progress reports due	March 15, 2023	TBD
Total award budget	Up to $150,000	Up to $1M per year
Time frame	October 1, 2022, through February 28, 2023 (5 months)	Five years (60 months)

GUIDELINES FOR PLANNING GRANT PROPOSAL

Please complete the Proposal Cover Sheet and include it as the first pages in your proposal. Please do not deviate from the order of the sections as it may delay your proposal's review. Planning grant proposals will be evaluated according to the following components. Proposals for the Center will require all the same components as in the planning grant but with additional detail and depth.

The following components are required.

- Proposal Cover Sheet (see separate document)
- Proposal Narrative (see below)
- Budget Narrative (see separate document)
- Budget Template (see separate spreadsheet)

Formatting Guidelines

- Page limit – Proposal limit is ten pages. Do not include appendices or links to external websites. All supporting tables and citations must be included within the ten-page proposal.
- Tables should have titles with clear labels and references in the narrative.
- Section titles, headers, and footers must be consistent throughout the document.
- Font size – Narrative must be 11-point Calibri, Helvetica, or Arial. Text in tables, figures, graphs, diagrams, and charts can be smaller, as long as the font is consistent with the narrative and legible.
- Spacing – Single space.
- Acronyms – Spell out acronyms the first time they are used and note the abbreviation in parentheses. The abbreviation can be used in subsequent sections.

Budget Guidelines

- Grant funds can be used for any activities related to preparing a full Center proposal and conducting a demonstration project. Below are some suggested uses.
- Up to $150k direct costs over five-month planning grant period. **Please see Guidelines for Budget Template and Narrative for detailed instructions.**
- Examples of budget lines are:
- $50k to bring consultant who has expertise outside of what the university offers, such as a consultant who can create a theory of change for cross-disciplinary collaboration. This person will likely be working with the university's development staff.
- $50k for core, cross-disciplinary faculty group to dedicate time to write the proposal and create a vision.
- $50k to do feasible demonstration project for the period of time in the planning grant—funding accounts for time required for faculty from different departments to meet, bond, and create new ideas, like a dedicated ideas lab session.

Proposal Narrative Guidelines

- Please include all sections marked with ✓ under the **planning requirement** column.
- Do not include sections that are blank under the planning requirement column.
- Center requirements are only included to assist applicants understand later steps.

DESCRIPTION	PLANNING REQUIREMENT	CENTER REQUIREMENT
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		
A. The Executive Summary should be a tightly written description of the program, its goals, methods, and anticipated outcomes. Summary is not to exceed 300 words.	✓	✓
B. Include requested total of grant.	✓	✓
II. VISION		
A. Identify existing gap(s) in neuroscience training and education.	✓	✓
B. Identify vision for the Center that addresses gaps.	✓	✓
III. PEOPLE		
A. Identify and provide bios for potential director(s) or co-director(s).	✓	✓
B. Identify associate directors or program leads.	✓	✓
C. Identify core faculty members.	✓	✓
D. Identify potential members, contributors, and advisors.	✓	✓
E. For each key personnel listed in the people section of the proposal and the budget, include biosketches (PHS 398 format), CV, or resumes. Documents can be 1-5 pages depending upon their background and years of experience. Documents should be submitted as PDFs and will not be counted as part of the proposal page limit.		✓
F. Include letters of support from all key personnel.		✓
IV. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND PLACEMENT		
A. Describe organization and governance of potential Center, including where it would reside in the university structure (e.g., within medical school, reporting to dean/provost for the School of Medicine).	✓	✓

B. Describe envisioned relationship between potential Center and other centers or resources at your institution, including but not limited to, existing resources and assets the center could harness, and how it would integrate and play a central role among existing centers or programs.	✓	✓
C. Include detailed budget for how personnel will be supported through Center funds. Also, see Institutional Commitment.		✓
D. Provide a plan for how institution will create a sustainable funding model past the initial five years of Dana support.		✓
V. PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES		
A. Share your initial ideas of what the Center may do and what you see as the desired outcomes.	✓	✓
B. Share at least two program ideas that the Center would enact and how the programs may be launched.	✓	✓
C. Detailed description of at least two programs, but ideally three or more.		✓
D. Timeline of implementation including evaluation process and metrics of success.		✓
VI. INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT		
A. Provide letter from college/university leadership (i.e., Provost or President) that illustrates material financial commitment to a Dana Center including financial or in-kind commitment that comprises at least a 50-percent match of Dana Funds. The institutional match should be materially significant to the institution.	✓	✓
B. Describe the leadership, departments, disciplines, physical space to be involved, and any other noteworthy institutional commitments.	✓	✓
C. Provide letters from all key leadership involved with different departments, schools, or programs that will be associated with Dana Center. Description of Institutional commitment must be detailed including line items and amounts.		✓

VII. CHALLENGES		
A. We appreciate you candidly describing what may be the greatest challenge(s) you anticipate in creating or sustaining a potential Center at your institution.	✓	✓
B. Please note how these challenges may be addressed through Dana support.	✓	✓
C. Please state additional challenges learned during the planning grant and how they will be addressed in the Center proposal.		✓

VIII. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT		
A. Identify one program idea to describe in greater detail.	✓	✓
B. Outline how this program will be created, implemented, and evaluated within the timeframe of the planning grant.	✓	✓
C. Provide detailed report about demonstration project including successes, failures, challenges, and opportunities for change.		✓
D. Provide examples of how program could be modified in the future given experience during the planning grant.		✓

IX. COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION		
A. The Dana Foundation affirms that diversity positively affects performance, creativity, and other organizational outcomes of success. Individuals from diverse backgrounds and life experiences bring different perspectives, creativity, and individual enterprise to address complex scientific and societal problems. Describe how the proposed Center would leverage diverse perspectives to advance the Center's objectives and support equity and inclusion in the Center's work and within its local community.	✓	✓
B. What are some potential collaborations outside the Center that can be further strengthen its commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion?		✓