



New Harvest Fellowship

Application Process

Eligibility

- PhD student or Postdoc
 - Preference is given to applicants who have completed the coursework phase of their degree and are focused full-time on research.
 - *We've found that while the fellowship is supportive during those first coursework-heavy years, fellows get more out of the fellowship if they are focused full-time on research.*
- Affiliated with a university or other institution where they can carry out their research
- Have identified a PI who is supportive of their cell ag research
- Could be based anywhere in the world

Application

The application consisted of:

- **Research proposal**
 - [Research proposal template](#)
 - [Research proposal example](#)
- **Personal statement**
 - Up to 1000 words
 - **Prompt:** *Describe the experiences that have shaped your desire to enter the field of cellular agriculture and how the New Harvest fellowship can help you achieve your future goals.*
 - Review criteria:
 - **Self-analysis and critical thinking:** Thoughtful analysis of the significance of their life experiences and the influence these have had on their values, behavior, decisions, and goals.
 - **Identification of Challenges & Resilience:** Thoughtful reflection on how they might be challenged during their fellowship and appear to have the resilience needed to overcome challenges and complete their fellowship.
 - **Future Goals:** Desires a career that will have a positive impact on the field of cellular agriculture and discusses how the NH fellowship will help them achieve these goals.



- **Writing & Ability to Clearly Communicate Ideas:** The writing is professional. There are almost no errors in spelling, punctuation, and grammar. Ideas are clearly expressed and easy to understand.
- **CV**
- **Demographics**
 - We began collecting this data in 2020 to aid in DEA efforts in our application process.

Internal Review

New Harvest staff (the research directors) do a brief internal review to eliminate any proposals that were ineligible or out of scope.

External Review

- We have all proposals reviewed by **at least 2 external reviewers**. To help with identifying reviewers, we ask applicants to recommend 3 reviewers when they submit their application. We did not necessarily use these suggestions, but they were helpful to get started.
- [External review questions](#)
- [Example external review](#)
- **Note:** the external review process is complex and time-consuming! Plan plenty of time and assume some reviewers will not complete the review on time (or at all). But, we do feel this is important to ensure our review process is unbiased and scientifically sound.
- **Note:** we have debated if this review process should be open or blinded. Until 2021 they were fully open. Starting in 2021, they were single-blinded (reviewers' names were hidden), and we have considered making it a double-blind review in the future.

Proposal Resubmission

- We ask all applicants to respond to the reviewers' comments and submit a revised proposal. To make it easier for us to review, we ask all changes to be highlighted.
- The goal of revised proposals is to see how the applicant responds to reviewers' comments and adapts their proposal.
 - We want to see strong critical thinking as well as an openness to feedback

Interviews

- We hold an interview with every **applicant** at this stage and every **PI/advisor**
 - [Interview Questions](#)



- **Note:** We do this for every applicant who submitted a revised proposal. We feel that the person is as, or more, important as the project, so we do not eliminate anyone based on their research proposal alone.
- **Note:** We've had some PIs be very surprised by our desire to interview them! But, we feel it is very important to understand the support the fellow will be getting as well as get buy-in from the PI early on regarding NH's philosophy. A poor interview with a PI doesn't disqualify an application, but we have to think about whether New Harvest can provide the support and resources to ensure the fellow is set up for success.

Final Review

Major Selection Criteria Used

The person:

- Do they have the passion and excitement to be a leader in cell ag?
- Does it seem like New Harvest's support would empower them in their career?
- Does the person seem to align with New Harvest's mission?
- Preference is given to individuals who expressed a desire and intent to continue in a non-industry career (academic, nonprofit, etc) after completing the fellowship.
- **Neglectedness:** Especially later in our research program, we've felt our grants are most impactful when they're going to neglected areas/students. As such, we prioritized students at universities without any prior cell ag work, with non-traditional backgrounds, or from underprivileged communities.

The project:

- Is the project scientifically sound? Is the timeline realistic?
- Will the results of the project be open?
- How does the project complement the rest of the current research cohort? Does the proposed work add new or under-represented research areas to the New Harvest research portfolio?
- Will the applicant have the support needed (from their advisor/university and the New Harvest community)?
- Does the work bring new approaches to cellular agriculture (like scaling, speed, or novel tech)?
- Does the proposed research significantly advance the field of cellular agriculture?