

## **ORIGINAL FDA HANDBOOK CRITERIA**

### **11.4.4. Evaluation**

In evaluating and ranking applications, the following are the primary factors that will be considered:

- a) How well the proposal meets the purposes of the program for which application is made;
- b) The value of the project to the applicant's growth and professional status; the value of the project to the scholarly community;
- c) The value of the project to the applicant's teaching responsibilities and students;
- d) The value of the project to the University;
- e) The value of the project to the non-academic community;
- f) The probability that the project will be carried out (to be measured in terms of the applicant's background, previous success, and attainability of the goals stated);
- g) The ability of the applicant to convey the content and importance of the project to those outside the applicant's own academic discipline;
- h) Contribution of the project to the applicant's ongoing scholarship or creative activity;
- i) Investigation of alternative funding sources;
- j) The urgency of the project to be undertaken; and
- k) Overall quality of the proposal.

Other things being equal, preference should be given, first, to a candidate who has not previously received a program award; second, to a candidate without tenure; and, third, to a candidate who received a program award the longest time ago.

## **UPDATED** FDA EVALUATION CRITERIA for HANDBOOK

**Notes:** Benefits Committee APPROVED, Faculty Senate Reviewed and Revised

### **11.4.4. Evaluation**

In evaluating and ranking applications, the following are the primary factors that will be considered:

- a) How well the proposal meets the purposes of the program for which application is made;
- b) Overall quality of the proposal;
- c) The urgency of the project to be undertaken;
- d) The ability of the applicant to convey the content and importance of the project to those outside the applicant's own academic discipline;
- e) The value, utility, merit or worth of the project (to be measured in terms of applicant's growth and/or professional status, teaching responsibilities and students, scholarship/creative activity and scholarly community, the university and non-academic community);
- f) The probability that the project will be carried out (to be measured in terms of the applicant's background, previous success, and attainability of the goals stated);
- g) Investigation of alternative funding sources and other commitments;
- h) Inclusion of required support documents.

Other things being equal, preference should be given, first, to a candidate who has not previously received a program award; second, to a candidate without tenure; third, to a candidate who received a program award the longest time ago; and, fourth, faculty who have submitted simultaneous, co-dependent applications.

**Quality (a-d) = 50%; Value (e) = 30%; Diligence (f-h) = 20%**

Updates based on Faculty Senate Meeting suggestions on April 22, 2024:

- Added the letter (d) to the word "and" in letter e)
- Added the word "required" in letter h)

## CHANGES / REVISIONS

Notes: approved by 92% of the Benefits Committee on 3.13.24

### 11.4.4. Evaluation

In evaluating and ranking applications, the following are the primary factors that will be considered:

- a) How well the proposal meets the purposes of the program for which application is made;
- b) Overall quality of the proposal; **Moved up in criteria order from k to b**
- c) The urgency of the project to be undertaken; **Moved up in criteria order from j to c**
- d) The ability of the applicant to convey the content and importance of the project to those outside the applicant's own academic discipline; **Moved up in criteria order from g to d**
- e) The value, utility, merit or worth of the project (to be measured in terms of applicant's growth and/or professional status, teaching responsibilities an students, scholarship/creative activity and scholarly community, the university and non-academic community); **(Moved down in criteria order; Change letter from b to e; combined the original b-e and h- and removed original h)- Change in Verbiage & added parentheticals**
- f) The probability that the project will be carried out (to be measured in terms of the applicant's background, previous success, and attainability of the goals stated);
- g) Investigation of alternative funding sources and other commitments;
- h) **Inclusion of support documents**. New criteria added

Other things being equal, preference should be given, first, to a candidate who has not previously received a program award; second, to a candidate without tenure; third, to a candidate who received a program award the longest time ago; and, **fourth, faculty who have submitted simultaneous, co-dependent applications**. New criteria added

**Quality (a-d) = 50%; Value (e) = 30%; Diligence (f-h) = 20%**