



Criteria for Reviewing Summer Research Support (SRS) Grant Proposals

COMMITTEE REVIEWER CRITERIA

Below are the criteria each member of the CRC Arts + Humanities Program Enhancement Grant (AHPEG) Review Committee will use to assist them in (a) critiquing the 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 and/ or Co-PI(s)' area of research?
- Are the goals/objectives of the project clear?
- Does the proposal state:
 - The scholarly and, where appropriate, the artistic merits of the proposed activity?
 - The effect the project will have on advancing knowledge and understanding in the field represented by the proposed work?
 - The relationship of the work to existing or planned institutional research and creative programs and capacities as a statement of how the proposed program would enhance research and creative activity at FSU?

• **Research Methods/Creative Activities:**

- Are the research methods and/or creative activities appropriate considering the goals/objectives of the project?
- Does the proposal indicate:

- The vision, productivity, qualifications, and capabilities of the project leader (and the rest of the team, if appropriate)?
- The performance capabilities of the PI?
- Where appropriate, the overall integration, coherence, and credibility of the efforts among disciplines and researchers who would carry out the proposed plan?

• **Significance of Intended Outcomes:**

- Are the intended project outcomes of potential importance/significance?
Does the proposal state, where appropriate:
 - The potential and cultural significance of new and original works?
 - The cultural enrichment impact of the project and/or performance?

• **Anticipated External Funding/Co-funding:**

- Is it likely that the proposed research or creative activity will enhance the prospects for external funding or recognition?
- Does the plan for seeking external funding seem reasonable, or, if a final presentation, has previous funding or co-funding been well-implemented?
- Where appropriate, is there a plan for long-term artistic, scholarly, and/or financial sustainability of the project based on increased external funding?

• **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, exhibition, or performance date?

• **Budget:**

- In reference to the Project Goals/Objectives and the Proposed Research Methods/Creative Activities, does the project budget seem reasonable?
- Is the budget appropriate for the project in regards to its duration, staffing, and purchasing needs?
- Is it evident in the plan that the PI and/or project team has the capacity to utilize the funds, including any contributions indicated in the Letters of Financial Support?
- Are the supplies/materials, travel, and/or other budgeted items allowable, clearly detailed, and appropriate for the work proposed?
- Are external support plans described? These plans should indicate available external resources that may support the proposed research/ creative

endeavor, and they should include a statement describing the intent to apply to these external entities.

- Does the project have any existing support that could be leveraged to gain future external funding?

• Department/College Support:

- If the PI's and/or Co-PI(s)' department and/or college will be providing any special or non-routine support for the project, is it likely that such support will contribute to the success of the project?

• Professional Obligations:

- Are the PI's and/or Co-PI(s)' other professional obligations during the award period likely to interfere with their ability to successfully complete the project?
- Does the proposal clearly explain any existing or proposed funding that would overlap with this award period?

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 MUST include comments that indicate the reasoning for their scores. --

Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance or Strengths/Weaknesses
1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
2	Very Good	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
3	Good	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
Typical Funding Line <hr style="border: 1px solid red;"/>		
4	Satisfactory	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
5	Average	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
6	Fair	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
7	Marginal	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
8	Poor	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
9	Unacceptable	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

- Major Weakness: A 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 AHPEG Review Committee or be eligible for funding. The AHPEG Review Committee will not need to review the following items:

• Eligibility

- Is the project team (PI and any Co-PIs) eligible to apply for a CRC Arts & Humanities Program Enhancement Grant?
- Has the PI or any Co-PI(s), received an AHPEG in the past two years?

• Proposal Submission

- Has the PI correctly completed all of the required forms?
- Was the application properly completed within the portal? Have the Co-PI(s), if any, and their departments been indicated in 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 **8** pages, excluding references and appendices? Is the text properly formatted (11pt Arial or Times New Roman font, 1" margins)?
- Are the Letters of Financial Support that are detailed in the grant proposal uploaded to certify all such cited contributions?
- Have any specialized Research Compliance Forms (animal or human subjects, conflict of interest, hazardous materials, etc.) been indicated and/or uploaded as required?
- Has the Past, Current, and Pending Grants section of the portal been properly completed? Have all CRC awards/grants in the last 5 years been disclosed by the PI and Co-PI(s)? Have outcomes been given for each?
- 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?
- Have the CVs for the PI and Co-PI(s) 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?