Reviewer Tenzing Briggs for **Grant Writer Petraq Kosho**

Dr. L'Eplattenier, Grant Writing

16 April 2025

Peer Review Edits for **J. M. Kaplan Fund's Innovation Prize Grant**

Overall Requirements

Questions	Yes	Needs Work	No
Is this a good match with the foundation's goals?	X		
Does the project look similar to previously funded projects?	X		
Is the writer following the RFP format?	X*		X*
Does the grant follow the RFP guide lines? (font size, character/word/page count, appendices guidelines, etc)	X*		X*
Are they using the RFP headings in the order presented?	X		
Have all the questions been answered?	X		
Does the information in the answer actually answer the question or is the writer just filling in the blanks with words or information that belongs elsewhere? (If this is happening, you should write a comment in the grant section to that effect.	X		

* Yes, there is a Letter of Interest, which I consider as an RFP format, which you follow exactly; I only place an X in "No" here since the main fund draft itself is separate from the LOI and not based on an RFP but the generic criteria outline, so the full document (draft + LOI) both follows an RFP format for only a partial portion.

Overall Purpose Requirements (The Grant as a Whole)
Would I fund this grant?

Yes, I am confident I would fund this grant. The only reason I don't say "Absolutely!" (because this is an excellent draft) is the unique situation for the draft, which is the fact that J. M. Kaplan Innovation Prize has several application phases. At this point, the LOI and main draft are both excellent, but at this point its not clear if the language and formatting needs to be changed in future edits to better reflect whatever main RFP format will come in later applications.

Why? Why not?

There are several reasons I would fund this grant, which I'll break down into considerations of audience, organization, and readability. That said, all three are excellent, and my comments on each will be on what each does well. J. M. Kaplan will find that this grant not only fits their and the Innovation Prize's mission but that it is incredibly detailed and meticulously organized.

For the audience, this grant clearly carefully considers the audience's point of view and mission. That is, it not only fits the J. M. Kaplan Innovation Prize's mission but explicitly explains each of the elements that they require. Namely, their site lists Social Justice as one area of concern and innovation that uses as a "game-changing answer to a clearly identified need" and that holds out "promise to benefit multiple individuals, communities, or sectors through a clearly articulated theory of change." This grant explains all those things and more, and the LOI portion quickly explains all the relevant parts that explicitly connect to that mission: the partnership with the DLBA that I would agree is a game-changer, the clearly identifiable barriers that immigrants in Detroit and the nation face with poverty and property ownership, and how Global Detroit will ensure the creation of a program that benefits immigrants across the board through notable and careful methods, like inclusion of muli-lingual or bi-lingual staff and advertisements. Moreover, the main grant draft also makes these things explicit, but with much more detail than what is in the LOI.

The organization and readability are similarly exemplary. My only suggestion would be to have more paragraphs prior to the bulleted lists, that introduce them and their main sectioning. That said, the bulleted lists are already strong on their own due to how detailed they are, such as how the specificity of number/quantitative features in the GOM bullet points or how the budget takes one list (the "Breakdown" bullet points specifying main sections like Marketing and Staffing) that later becomes the outline for an extremely detailed expense report table.

Overall, this is incredibly strong draft, with little changes to be made. I have included minor suggestions in the Grants as Section portion of this peer review.

What would make this grant more fundable?

I have few edits for this grant. I almost wouldn't call it a draft; every section is complete, detailed, well-sourced, and both quantitative and qualitative. Potentially, the only major consideration in future edits will be to reformat the language and organization to whatever RFPs come in later application phases. Another minor addition would be to consider adding introductory paragraphs before some of the bulletpoint lists.

What advice would you give the writer if you are reading from a hostile audience point of view? From a pretending to be the author point of view?

If I were reading from a hostile audience point of view, I may worry that there are other projects just as innovative as this one that are coming from startups in an earlier lifetime phase (which, on their website, they make a key part of eligibility of the Innovation Prize: awardees are specified to have to be innovative *and* in a early or pilot stage). From this hostile point of view,

the Need for Funding and Support section was the main (but also essentially only) section where I found I had questions, namely if Global Detroit was young enough to qualify for the Innovation Prize (since it was founded more than a decade ago) and whether other funders as described in the budget would mean possible disqualification.

From the author point of view, I would suggest that future edits focus on adding an explicit description of the situations of having other funders and the age of the project under Need for Funding and Support. That is, my main suggestion to address the hostile point of view's possible concern would be to explicitly highlight that, even though the project has received funding from other sources and Global Detroit is a nonprofit more than ten years old, that funding (compared to the funding from K. M. Kaplan Fund Innovation Prize) would only be a small overall percent. You should emphasize that funding is incomplete and that, despite Global Detroit being a nonprofit organized more than a decade ago, this individual project is still in its early stages, being less than one year old. From this point of view, there is also the minor fact that some bulletpoint lists could include introductory paragraphs before them.

Overall Genre Requirements (The Grant as Sections)
History/Organization

The "Abstract" section does a great job of describing concisely the program's nonprofit and its motivations. The "History of Global Detroit and Commitment to Immigrant Communities" section does a great job of framing Global Detroit as an innovative hero, by summarizing how it has both helped immigrants in numerous cultural and financial situations while spearheading key reports.

Problem Statement

The "Need for Funding and Support" succinctly describes issues that immigrants face in poverty and property ownership, while citing a significant number of good sources. Moreover, there's a very clear claim of what the problem is. In other words, this section is both clear and persuasive.

Project Statement

The "Project Description" section does a great job of outlining the Homeownership Initiative. What is most convincing about its effectiveness is the fact that it will aim to tackle the problem with multiple features, that are each specific and restricted enough that it does so without seeming like it has "design creep" (i.e. it doesn't seem unrealistic in the scope of what it aims to do).

Outputs/GOM

The "Goals, Objectives, and Methods" is especially robust in how there is one clear goal that is supported by multiple objectives and methods. One possible improvement could be to add introductory paragraphs before the Objectives and Methods bulletpoints, which could also be used to discuss which Methods connect to which Objectives.

Budget

       The "Budget" section and the related "Personell" section are both incredibly detailed (especially the Budget). I think the simple bulletpoint structure in each of these works quite well, and the fact that the budget is broken down both in an overall Breakdown list and in a much more detailed table makes it very, very robust.