



Criteria for Reviewing Seed Grant Proposals

COMMITTEE REVIEWER CRITERIA

Below are the criteria each member of the CRC Seed Grant 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.

• Appropriateness for Seed Grant funding:

- Does the PI explain how the proposed work represents a new direction in research or creative activity?
- or**
- Does the PI explain how the proposed work represents continuing early support of existing research or scholarly activity?
- Does the PI explain why a Seed Grant is needed in lieu of submission of an external award?

• Project/Issue and Goals:

- Is the project/issue the project will address important/significant in the PI's and, if applicable, Co-PI(s)' area of research?
- Are the goals/objectives of the project clear?
- Is the project clearly differentiated from other pending or existing PI projects?
- 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 the PI/ Co-PI(s)' 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?

- Are the multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary partners, if applicable, clearly identified and well-suited to the project? Does the proposal indicate 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?
- **ASPIRE Alignment:**
 - Does the proposal clearly state which FSU ASPIRE research goal their project aligns with, and why?
- **Anticipated External Funding:**
 - Is it likely that the proposed research or creative activity will enhance the prospects for future external funding and are the resulting external funding or outcome plans described clearly and specifically?
 - Does the plan for seeking external funding seem reasonable?
- **Schedule of Project Activities:**
 - Does the schedule of project activities seem realistic?
 - Does the proposal indicate the anticipated progress during the grant period?
- **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 and appropriate for the work proposed?
 - Is the budget appropriate for the project in regards to its duration, staffing, and purchasing needs? Does the staffing budget (including graduate students and postdoc salaries) clearly link to the project activities, feasibility and success?
- **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 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 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 CRC Seed Grant Review Committee or be eligible for funding. The Seed 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 Seed Grant?
- Has the PI or any Co-PI(s) received a Seed Grant the past year?

• Proposal Submission

- 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 (not counting 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 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?