

Faculty Senate Benefits Committee
Project Grant Evaluation Criteria

Purpose: Faculty Project Grants are awarded to tenured or tenured track faculty to provide funds to pay for expenses, purchase equipment, and to cover other financial needs for sabbatical leaves, faculty summer fellowships, or for other university affiliated instructional, scholarly, and creative activities.

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 clearly addresses...

a1. The purpose of a project grant to provide funds to support university affiliated instructional, scholarly and creative activity

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 funding (background information and why the funding is necessary / important)

b4. States the purpose of the project funding (what will be discovered/learned/developed; how might funds help expand knowledge, scholarship, creative abilities, classroom experiences and/or or with student advancement, etc.)

b5. Describes how funds will be utilized to achieve purpose

b6. Provides 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 detailed budget with justification of budget items with tentative, feasible timeline for implementation of project funds.

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

Faculty Senate Benefits Committee
Project Grant Evaluation Criteria

c. The urgency of the project to be undertaken

This proposal clearly addresses that the project ...

- c1. Requires time-sensitive efforts, action or funds.
- c2. Is an urgent need or pressing problem

d. The ability of the applicant to effectively 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
Project Grant 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, utility, merit or worth 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
Project Grant 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. Investigation of other funding sources examined (received, may receive or investigated) for this project, including those at the department level

g2. Other current or potential paid time 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) 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
Project Grant 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