FSU
Council on Research
+ Creativity

Criteria for Reviewing Summer Research Support (SRS) Grant Proposals

COMMITTEE REVIEWER CRITERIA

Below are the criteria each member of the Summer Research Support (SRS) Review Group 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 considering the goals/objectives of the project?

- **Significance of Intended Outcomes:**
  - Are the intended project outcomes of potential importance/significance?

- **Anticipated External Funding:**
  - Is it likely that the proposed research or creative activity will enhance the prospects for external funding or advance the reputation of the PI or FSU in the field?
  - Does the plan for seeking external funding seem reasonable?

- **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?

• **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?

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
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 SRS Review or be eligible for funding. The SRS Review Group will **not** need to review the following items:

- **Eligibility**
  - Is the PI eligible to apply for an SRS Grant?
  - Has the PI received a COFRS award in the past three years?
  - Has the PI been the recipient of a FYAP award? Have they obtained tenure?

- **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 **8** 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?
  - 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? Have outcomes been given for each?
  - 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?