



Criteria for Reviewing First Year Assistant Professor (FYAP) Grant Proposals

COMMITTEE REVIEWER CRITERIA

Below are the criteria each member of the CRC First Year Assistant Professor (FYAP) Review Committee will use to assist them in (a) critiquing a proposal, (b) providing useful feedback to the PI, and (c) determining an overall score for the proposal.

Keep in mind that each section of the proposal text should be written in clear, concise language so that reviewers from any discipline will be able to understand what is being stated.

- **Project/Issue and Goals:**
 - Is the issue the project will address important/significant in the PI's area of research?
 - Are the goals/objectives of the project clear?
- **Research Methods/Creative Activities:**
 - Are the research methods and/or creative activities appropriate in light of the goals/objectives of the project?
- **Career Path and Broader Impacts:**
 - Is the project clearly related to the PI's long-term research goals?
- **Anticipated External Funding:**
 - Is it likely that the proposed research or creative activity will enhance the prospects for external funding?

Note: As compared to several of the other CRC grant programs, there will be less emphasis in the FYAP proposal review on the eventual acquisition of external funding. However, this does not totally remove the need for external funding consideration.

- **Schedule of Project Activities:**
 - Does the schedule/ timeline of project activities seem realistic?
 - Does the proposal indicate the anticipated progress during the grant period?
 - Is there a plan for completion of the project, including start and completion dates, or the anticipated publication or performance date?
- **Budget:**
 - In reference to the Project Goals/Objectives and the Proposed Research Methods/Creative Activities, does the project budget seem reasonable?

- Are the supplies/materials, travel, and/or other budgeted items clearly detailed, allowable, and appropriate for the work proposed?
- **Differentiation from Dissertation Research:**
 - Is the proposed project a substantive departure from or modification/ expansion of the PI's dissertation work?
- **Mentoring Plan:**
 - Does the plan for mentoring the PI during their early career seem to be adequate?
- **Professional Obligations:**
 - Are the PI's other professional obligations during the award period likely to interfere with their ability to successfully complete the project?
 - Does the PI clearly explain any existing or proposed funding that would overlap with this award period?
- **Previous Awards or Grant Funds Received:**
 - Have past awards – particularly any CRC awards – been used effectively to further to PI's research goals?

SCORING SCALE

Reviewers should provide a numeric score and comments for each proposal, identifying minor/moderate/major weaknesses specifically to correlate with the chart below. Reviewers also should indicate whether or not the proposal should be revised and resubmitted in the next award cycle (2024-2025).

SCORE	DESCRIPTOR	POTENTIAL	IMPACT	ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE FOR STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES*
1	Exceptional	Fundable	High	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
2	Very Good	Fundable		Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
3	Good	Fundable		Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
TYPICAL FUNDING LINE				
4	Satisfactory	Potentially Fundable	Medium	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
5	Average	Potentially Fundable		Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
6	Fair	Potentially Fundable		Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
7	Marginal	Not Fundable	Low	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
8	Poor	Not Fundable		A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
9	Unacceptable	Not Fundable		Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

* *Minor Weakness:* An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact.

Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact but may be addressed with minor to moderate changes.

Major Weakness: A substantial weakness that severely limits impact.

PROGRAM STAFF CRITERIA

Below are the criteria the CRC Program Staff will use to review each proposal. If any of these criteria are not met, the proposal will be disqualified from competition and will not be reviewed by the CRC First Year Assistant Professor Review Committee or be eligible for funding. The CRC FYAP Review Committee will not need to review the following items:

- **Eligibility**

- Is the PI eligible to apply for a CRC First Year Assistant Professor Grant?
- Has the PI completed all requirements of their terminal degree?
- Is the PI in their first or second year appointed as an active, full-time Assistant Professor at FSU?
- Did the PI attend the entire 2023 FYAP Workshop?

- **Proposal Submission**

- Has the PI correctly completed all of the required forms?
- Was the application properly completed within the portal?
- Does the Proposal Text include all of the required sections? Is each section properly titled and numbered? Is the length of the proposal text no more than **5** pages, excluding References and Appendices? Is the text properly formatted (11pt Arial or Times New Roman font, 1" margins)?
- Have any specialized Research Compliance Forms (animal or human subjects, conflict of interest, hazardous materials, etc.) been uploaded and/or indicated?
- Has the Proposal Budget Summary been properly completed? Is the proposed use of the award funds acceptable in light of the funding rules for this grant program?
- Has the CV been properly completed?
- Did the PI submit the proposal in time to meet the submission deadline? Did the Chair(s) and Dean(s) approve the proposal by their approval deadline?