

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*.

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

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

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

This proposal:

a1. Clearly 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 clearly...

b1. Follows the requested format

b2. Addresses all requirements of the application

b3. Presents a logical, reasoned argument for the project (background information and why the proposed is necessary / important)

b4. States the purpose of the project (what will be discovered / learned / developed by completing the project, how will the project add to or expand upon the field)

b5. Provides a detailed project description / procedure (i.e. Who, What, When, Where)

b6. Utilizes adequate academic references and in-text citations

b7. Identifies tangible outcomes (resulting products) of the project using goals that are specific, measurable, action-oriented, realistic and time-oriented (SMART)

b8. Provides a tentative timeline for the project that is feasible (includes actions and dates).

b9. States fair criteria for evaluating the success of the project

Faculty Senate Benefits Committee
Summer Fellowship Evaluation Criteria

c. The urgency of the project to be undertaken

This proposal clearly addresses 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 ...

- d1. Describes content (i.e. importance, value, procedures, etc.) 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
1	2	3	4	5

e. The value of the project

This proposal clearly addresses the potential value, utility, merit, or worth to each of the following ...

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 / Artistic community (i.e. scholarly activity, research, advanced study or artistic performance; *AND* potential impact on scholarly / artistic community

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

e5. The Non-Academic community (i.e., General, non-academic community OR Public sector, government, education, or social service community OR 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
1	2	3	4	5

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 addresses ...

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.)

g. Alternative funding sources and other commitments

This proposal clearly addresses ...

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

This proposal clearly addresses ...

h1. Support documents (i.e., vita, previous awards and FDA; Letters from collaborators, publishers, or other individuals, groups or organizations; etc.) demonstrating the applicant's ability to complete the project.

h2. Adequate support (i.e., supportive dean/chair letters) indicating the strong merit of the proposal.

Faculty Senate Benefits Committee
Summer Fellowship Evaluation Criteria

Other Evaluation Considerations
(Referenced from the Faculty Handbook)

Answer these questions. This information will ONLY be used during evaluations if proposals are deemed relatively "Equal"

1. Has the applicant previously received a Program Award?
2. Is the applicant tenure track?
3. When was the last time the applicant received a Program Award?
4. Is the proposal co-dependent on another Program award?

How to use the information from these questions:

In the event that other things (prior to this section) are equal, preference should be given first to:

1. Candidate who has not previously received a program award
2. Candidate on tenure track (without tenure)
3. Candidate who received program award the longest time ago
4. Candidate who has submitted simultaneous, co-dependent proposal/application