Grant writing for language activists and linguists

University of California at Santa Barbara, June 24-28, 2008

Margaret Florey

Monash University

Spike Gildea

University of Oregon

Knut Olawsky

Mirima Dawang Woorlab-Gerring Language and Culture Centre

Susan Penfield

University of Arizona

Day 4

- Filling in the framework
  - *Participants will work on the main sections of the grant application in this class.*
  - *We will look at the requirements for the background and literature review sections.*
  - *Students will begin to identify appropriate methods, determine the technological needs of the project and build a timeline.*

▪ **Review**

- ▪ Read out your draft 100 word project summary
- ▪ 5 key words

Project Summary

- **Intellectual Merit** The proposed project will produce video and audio documentation of two highly endangered indigenous languages, Mohave and Chemehuevi. Both languages are still used on the Colorado River Indian Tribes Reservation (CRIT) where a formal survey, conducted by the tribal library in 2002, revealed just 42 speakers of Mohave and 5-7 speakers of Chemehuevi, all over the age of 60. Work on the syntax of both languages was conducted in the 1970s; some work with phonology and electronic documentation of lexical items was begun in 2003. There has been no documentation of naturallyoccurring conversation and earlier audio recordings are technically inadequate for high fidelity archiving.

- This project actively involves tribal members in data collection by training them in elicitation procedures using video and audio equipment. The project team will consist of two tribal members from each group (Mohave and Chemehuevi), the PI who has over 35 years of experience in the CRIT community, and two doctoral-level graduate students (one in phonetics and documentation; the other in syntax and pedagogy). The team goals are 1) to carry out video and audio documentation of conversational practices and recorded narrative in both languages, 2) to provide training for tribal members in technology-based documentation of their languages and descriptive linguistics while engaged in fieldwork both on-site and on-line, 3) to use collected materials for constructing language lessons in support of the tribes' goal of language revitalization, 4) to construct text, audio and video databases and, 5) to work with tribal members to construct a standard set of protocols for indigenous communities regarding issues of the public access and use of digital archives and databases.

- **Broader Impact** The project results will increase the general understanding of the process and value of video documentation for endangered languages, add substantially more linguistic data for Mohave and Chemehuevi, evaluate the use of technology for on-line fieldwork, and generate guidelines for indigenous communities regarding the public use of digital databases and archives. This project builds on previous work which generated a handbook for tribal members on the development of multimedia language lessons. Technology-Enhanced Language Revitalization (Penfield, et.al. 2004) is available in PDF format online and is now the text for a course at the American Indian Language Development Institute (AILDI) which enrolls students from many different tribes. The current project will result in the development of a similar handbook for tribal members devoted to language documentation. It will also propose a curriculum for an AILDI course on language documentation and will establish a model to be shared at AILDI and on-line for tribal members to employ in determining public access and use of digitallyarchived materials

June 24-28, 2008   **Grant writing**

Project participants and credibility

- To get a grant, a funding agency must be convinced that you are the right person, or group of people, to do the work.

- Each member of the team, both internal and external to the language community, may face different challenges in doing that at different stages in their life and/or career.

- As you look at the sample proposals, check the evidence for justifying the participants.

Background and literature review

- Your proposal needs to be written in the context of other work which has been done on the language.

- If you haven't done it yet, you need to know everything that's been written or researched about the language.

- This will entail, for example:

  - a library search

  - a search of archives

  - talking with community members to find out what they know about the work that has already been done.

- Look at the sample literature review and exercises in the Grant Writing handout (Zepeda and Penfield)

Day 4— exercise 1 (~15 minutes)

- Working in your small group

- <u>Methods</u>

  - Look back at the 3 major objectives for your grant that you wrote in Class 3.

  - List the methods you will use to achieve them.

  - Suggest the time involved in each activity.

  - List the personnel required to complete each activity.

Objective	Method	Time	Personnel
1.			
2.			
3.			

Technological needs

- We need to balance
  - best equipment
  - what works best for people new to documentation
  - particular circumstances and settings
- It's important to be flexible and ready to make changes as necessary

Day 4— exercise 2 (~10 minutes)

- Working in a small group
- <u>Technological needs</u>
  - Think about the objectives and needs of your project and prepare a short equipment list

Objective	Equipment
1.	
2.	
3.	

Homework

- Overnight, think about the timeline for your project. Will you be able to complete it within 6 months? A year? Two years?

- Start drafting a work plan for the project tasks.

- For the class tomorrow, bring your completed summary and work plan.