

Faculty Senate Benefits Committee
Summer Fellowship Evaluation Criteria

Purpose: Faculty Summer Fellowships are awarded to tenured or tenured track faculty to promote professional development and/or effectiveness of faculty and/or improve teaching by conducting research, working on creative/artistic projects, attending seminars, writing manuscript(s), conducting pilot studies or conducting literature review(s) *during the summer months*.

Scoring Note: To be marked N/A the applicant must make it clear that the item/criteria was N/A to their project. N/A does not influence the overall evaluation score.

DIMENSION 1: OVERALL QUALITY
Relative weight 0.5
Comprised of handbook criteria a, b, c, d

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

a. How well the proposal meets the purpose of the program for which the application is made

The proposed project:

- a1. Promotes the professional development and effectiveness of the faculty by resulting in research, advanced study, creative/artistic project and/or improved teaching.
- a2. Will be completed during the summer months.

b. Overall quality of the proposal

This proposal ...

- b1. Follows the requested format
- b2. Addresses all requirements of the application
- b3. Presents a logical, reasoned argument for the project
- b4. States goal(s) and/or objective(s) of the project (**new**)
- b5. Provides a detailed project description (i.e. background, importance, procedures, etc.)
- b6. Provides a tentative timeline for the project that is feasible.
- b7. Utilizes adequate academic references and in-text citations
- b8. Identifies specific, tangible outcomes/products of the project using SMART goals (**new**)

Faculty Senate Benefits Committee
Summer Fellowship Evaluation Criteria

b9. States fair criteria for evaluating the success of the project (new)

c. The urgency of the project to be undertaken

This proposal clearly explains that the project...

- c1. Requires time-sensitive efforts and action by the applicant
- c2. Addresses an urgent need or pressing problem

d. The ability of the applicant to convey the project information and importance of the project to those outside the applicant's own academic discipline

This proposal's ...

- d1. Content (i.e. importance, value, procedures, etc.) is described in a clear, coherent and non-technical manner that is readily understandable or knowable

Faculty Senate Benefits Committee
Summer Fellowship Evaluation Criteria

DIMENSION 2: OVERALL VALUE
Relative weight 0.3
Comprised of handbook criteria e

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

e. The value of the project

The proposal addresses the potential value, utility, merit, or worth to ...

e1. Professional growth and/or status (i.e., professional development - advancement of knowledge, skills; advancement in rank or position, etc.)

e2. Teaching and Students (i.e., academic development; effectiveness of faculty - improved teaching or instruction in field, class, or online setting; coaching or mentoring student research or creative projects)

e3. Scholarship and the Scholarly community (i.e. scholarly activity, research, advanced study or artistic performance; *AND* potential impact on scholarly community)

e4. The University (i.e., community regional, or national reputation and status)

e5. The Non-Academic community (i.e., General, non-academic community; Public sector, government, education, or social service community; Private sector, business, commercial, retail, or industrial community)

Faculty Senate Benefits Committee
Summer Fellowship Evaluation Criteria

DIMESION 3: APPLICANT DILIGENCE
Relative weight 0.2
Comprised of handbook criteria f, g, h

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

f. The probability that the project will be carried out (to be measured in terms of the applicant's background, previous successes, and attainability of the goals stated)

This proposal clearly explains ...

- f1. The project has goals that are achievable in the time allotted
- f2. The project is likely to be performed or executed, given the applicants' background, expertise, and prior accomplishments (i.e. publications, presentations, references, creative activities, previous grants, etc.)
- f3. The success of the project is dependent on the acceptance of another FDA award

g. Alternative funding sources and other commitments

This proposal clearly explains ...

- g1. Other funding sources examined (received, may receive or investigated) for this project, including those at the department level
- g2. Other current or potential commitments from NKU and/or other institutions

h. Inclusion of Supporting Documents

The proposal includes ...

- h1. Support documents (i.e., vita, previous awards and FDA; Letters from collaborators, publishers, or other individuals groups or organizations; supportive dean/chair letters) demonstrating the applicants ability to complete the project.
- h2. Adequate support (i.e., supportive dean/chair letters) indicating the strong merit of the proposal.