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I. GENERAL INFORMATION AND GUIDELINES FOR ALL FPDC GRANT PROGRAMS

These guidelines include directions and criteria that apply to all proposals submitted for the State System Faculty Professional Development Council (FPDC) Annual Grant Program. More specific information is appended to these guidelines. Be sure to adhere to Part I: General Information and Guidelines; the specific criteria and stipulations provided in Part II: Annual Grant Program; and the proposal preparation and submission instructions in Part III: Application Package.

PURPOSE

The State System of Higher Education Faculty Professional Development Council was established by Board of Governors' Policy 1985-06-A, “to encourage continuous attention to the professional growth and development of System faculty as teaching scholars.” The Council has addressed a wide range of faculty interests, needs, and talents, and provides professional development opportunities for faculty at all levels and in all disciplines and professional fields. The Annual Grant Program is intended to provide professional growth opportunities for individual faculty incorporated with the three strategic priorities of the Board of Governors in the System Redesign, which includes a strong focus on projects that encourage student success. A general definition of "faculty professional development," as the Council interprets it, is included in the Criteria and Definitions section on the following page.

SYSTEM REDESIGN

The Board of Governors has affirmed three strategic priorities as part of redesigning the System for Pennsylvania’s future:

- Ensuring Student Success
- Leveraging University Strengths
- Transforming the Governance and Leadership Structure

Student Success is the #1 priority. Serving more than 100,000 students from every county in Pennsylvania, the State System is the largest provider of higher education in the Commonwealth. Talented faculty and staff at each of the 14 universities deliver affordable, high-value, high-quality educational experiences to their students. In fact, “Ensuring Student Success” is not just a statement but our mission. The Board has affirmed the following Student Success Mission:

Our 14 State System Universities provide access to high-value, relevant educational experiences that prepare our students in a timely manner for pathways to successful lives and careers.

The FPDC determined at its Spring 2018 meeting that it will support the Student Success priority in the award of the 2018-2019 funds. Therefore, proposals must address Student Success by describing how the individual(s)’ professional development will translate to an impact on students, i.e. impact on faculty teaching and student learning. Examples of such impact include but are not limited to professional development that enables faculty to implement High Impact Practices, which include joint faculty-student research (Category 1-A of this RFP), service learning (Category 2), experiential learning, and capstone courses/projects, among others. Category 4, innovation in instruction and student learning, encompasses many of the remaining High Impact Practices. See https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips for more examples and information.

Proposals are not limited to faculty professional development on High Impact Practices and applicants are to provide their own explanation and demonstration of how their professional development proposal will impact student development and learning and subsequent success. This is further addressed in the Contents of the Proposal in Section III.

ELIGIBILITY

A proposal will not be considered if it is illegible, if it fails to comply with these guidelines, or if the information provided is incomplete.
1. Project Directors must be System faculty members. They may be Regular Faculty, defined as a “tenured or tenure track faculty member,” including Probationary Non-Tenured Faculty, defined as a “faculty member who is appointed to a tenure track position and who has not been granted tenure” (APSCUF CBA).

2. Eligibility of Non-Tenure Track Faculty (defined as a “faculty member who is appointed to service in a position in which service will not be credited toward tenure”, e.g., Temporary Part-Time or Temporary Full-Time or Regular Part-Time faculty) to participate in this grant program is at the discretion of the university. Check with your university faculty professional development committee.

3. Faculty may conduct grant-funded projects while on sabbatical but may not request salary for replacement faculty in these circumstances.

4. Project Directors of previous FPDC grant awards are eligible to apply, but their current proposals must include an appendix consisting of no more than one side of one page listing the year, title, and category of previous grants, briefly indicating project outcomes.

5. If the Project Director has not submitted a final project report for any current or previous FPDC awards, then s/he is NOT eligible to apply.

6. Please note the specific cost limits for release time and summer stipends on page 11, Budget Instructions.

7. A maximum of sixteen (16) proposals may be submitted from each university. The university’s Faculty Professional Development Committee (campus committee) makes recommendations to the university administration on the proposal(s) that will be forwarded to the FPDC. Signatures from both the university’s campus committee chairperson and the university provost (or designee) indicate endorsement of these recommendations.

**CRITERIA AND DEFINITIONS**

The following criteria will be applied in evaluating all grant proposals submitted to the FPDC:

1. **Potential Professional Development Benefits to be realized by Faculty Member(s) Involved**

   Professional development involves the acquisition of knowledge and/or development of skills related to some aspect of the faculty member’s professional responsibilities that correlate in some way to student success. This may involve increasing knowledge in one’s discipline, a related discipline, or interrelationships among disciplines. Other areas of consideration are knowledge about how students learn, about issues facing colleagues in business or basic education or another professional field, or about national trends and issues in higher education that can be translated to student outcomes. A faculty member may develop artistic skills, hone research skills, improve skills in organizing and integrating knowledge, develop pedagogical skills, sharpen performance skills, gain experience in using administrative skills, or learn how to use technology to enhance teaching and learning. The professional development lies in the learning that occurs in carrying out the project and the relevance of that learning to the faculty member’s ongoing growth and development as a professional teacher-scholar positively impacting student experiences. **Proposers should fully explain specifically how award of the grant will enhance their personal professional development and its connection to university students, using a minimum of 50 words or one paragraph.**

2. **Significance and Impact of the Proposed Project and its Projected Outcomes in Relation to the Purpose of the RFP and the specific Category**

   A priority will be given to projects that focus on student learning and development and ultimate student success. Proposers should answer the following: How do these funds impact student
outcomes that contribute to the mission of providing access to high-value, relevant educational experience that prepare students in a timely manner for pathways to successful lives and careers.

Significance and impact of the proposed project and its outcomes focuses on what others will learn or how they will benefit from the work. In addition to students, a secondary impact could include colleagues locally or nationally, other faculty at one’s own university and/or other institutions, members of community groups, government agencies, health-care organizations, public school personnel, etc. In addressing other audiences, proposers should answer the following: How much will others learn? How many stand to benefit from the project in one way or another? How important is the contribution to knowledge—and/or to the well-being of some target group—that the project promises?

3. Clarity, Completeness, and Reasonableness of the Proposal and the Budget Request, Including Adherence to These Guidelines (specifically address the following points as completely as possible in non-technical language):
   - what you or others have done previously that relates to your project
   - what you expect to accomplish
   - what work will be done during the course of the project
   - who will perform the work (i.e., include names of students, consultants, presenters, etc., whenever possible, to show advance planning for the project)
   - how the work will be performed
   - where the work will be performed
   - when the work will be performed (grants usually run for 14 to 16 months)

4. Feasibility of Realizing the Project’s Objectives Given Applicable Expertise, Financial Resources, and Proposed Timeline

5. Appropriateness for System Faculty Professional Development Council Funding

   Consider the nature of the project, items for which grant funding is requested, and the probable availability (or lack thereof) of other funding sources.

6. Adherence to Guidelines, including format, completeness and designation of correct category.
II. ANNUAL GRANT PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

GENERAL STIPULATIONS

In addition to the eligibility requirements listed in the General Information and Guidelines (page 2-4), the following stipulations apply specifically to the FPDC Annual Grant Program.

1. A faculty member may not submit more than one proposal for which he/she is to serve as the Project Director in the annual grant program.

2. Proposals submitted in response to this RFP will be considered only for the FPDC 2018-2019 Annual Grant Program.

3. As there is some overlap among RFP categories, in some cases the applicant and/or the campus FPD committee must choose the category that represents the “best fit” for the proposal.

4. Projects may start immediately upon receipt of an award notice from the FPDC. Projects are to be completed by October 31, 2020. Reports are to be submitted to the System FPDC and the campus committee within 30 days of the project’s completion, but no later than November 30, 2020. Any grant funds not used or encumbered by that date are to be returned to the FPDC.

5. The maximum grant award limit for individual annual grants awarded this year is $10,000. Grant proposals requiring amounts above $10,000 should be submitted to other funding sources or show on the budget how the additional amount is provided as a contribution from a university or other revenue source.

6. The Annual Grant Program is not intended to be a continuing support mechanism for ongoing projects.

7. Although future funding of the Annual Grant Program is not committed at this time, faculty members who receive awards in this round of grants are expected to serve as Peer Reviewers if and when the Annual Grants Program receives funding in future years.

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND DEADLINE

Campus committees will designate the deadline for submission of proposals for the campus screening process and will write this deadline in the space provided on the cover of these guidelines. The university should stipulate the number of copies to be submitted to the campus committee. The campus committee may enter additional instructions to University faculty here:

Up to sixteen (16) grant proposals, endorsed by the campus committee and university provost, must be delivered to the FPDC mailbox (fpdcpayment@passhe.edu), no later than 5:00 p.m., Monday, February __, 2019. All proposals must be submitted by electronic mail. Other methods of transmission or submission of grant proposals are not acceptable. Proposals must be in the form of one (1) PDF file. No other file formats will be accepted.

Any letters or forms requiring signatures should be scanned and included in the e-mail transmittal as a part of the PDF file. Proposals that do NOT include signed forms or required letters will NOT be accepted.

EVALUATION PROCESS FOR THE ANNUAL GRANT PROGRAM

The FPDC review process is collegial and relies on expert peer review and Council members for comments and rankings. The amount of feedback that can be provided on unsuccessful proposals is limited, but every attempt will be made to provide meaningful and helpful review comments. Faculty members are urged to work with their campus committees, grants officers, and other colleagues, in developing and garnering critiques of proposals prior to submission to the FPDC.
The award of funds to selected recipients is expected to be announced by mid-April in 2019.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE ANNUAL GRANT PROGRAM**

The Council anticipates it may receive up to 224 grant proposals this year, the maximum based on the grant limit. The total amount of money budgeted for the Annual Grants Program is approximately $400,000. At a maximum award of $10,000 funds may be sufficient for a maximum of 40 awards.

Funding reservations within this year's RFP:

1. **$300,000** for any faculty professional development activity authorized by the Council. The $300,000 is currently designated for this RFP. It may be awarded for Categories 1,2,3 and 5 and for any eligible faculty.

2. An additional **$50,000** is available for probationary faculty after the initial $300,000 is dispensed (defined as “a faculty member who is appointed to a tenure track position and who has not been granted tenure”). Proposals may be submitted in any Category.

3. **$50,000** for proposals that address innovation in teaching and improvement in student learning outcomes, which is Category 4 of this RFP. This allocation may not be used for any other Category.

The funding reservations are mandated by the 2018-2019 Collective Bargaining Agreement with the faculty union, APSCUF. If the $50,000 threshold is not awarded for probationary faculty and for Category 4 reservations, the balance of funds in each reservation will remain available for future years. Any balance of the $300,000 can be directed to faculty professional development activity authorized by the Council in current or future years.

The Council will make an attempt to proportionally award funds by Category (see Category definitions below). The Council is not obligated to award all funds. Un-awarded funds will remain available to the Council for its programs.

**Category 1-A: Joint Faculty-Student Research**

**Purpose** – To promote faculty and student interest and involvement in research projects in all disciplines where that research will contribute to professional growth. Research means a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalized knowledge. Applied research is broadly defined as problem-oriented research that has application beyond the scholarly community. All projects are expected to result in scholarly publications, an appropriate joint presentation, reports to appropriate public agencies or other organizations, and/or grant proposals to external agencies.

The proposal must address how it contributes to student success, i.e. the applicant must describe and demonstrate how students will benefit from the faculty’s professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning and subsequent success.

**Special Stipulations** – One or more undergraduate or graduate students enrolled at the institution at the time the research is conducted must participate in projects proposed in this category. The purpose is not, however, to fund essentially independent research by students. A student may not be the project director or principal investigator. The student(s) must work in partnership with the faculty member(s)—not merely for or under the faculty. Proposals must include an explanation of how students will be selected and how they will work with faculty both in the research and in the dissemination of its outcomes.

**Category 1-B: Faculty Research**

**Purpose** – To promote and support individual or joint faculty research projects in all disciplines where that research will contribute to professional growth. Research means a systematic investigation, including
research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalized knowledge. Applied research is broadly defined as problem-oriented research that has application beyond the scholarly community. All projects are expected to result in an appropriate presentation, demonstration, publication, reports to appropriate public agencies or other organizations, and/or grant proposals to external agencies.

The proposal must address how it contributes to student success, i.e. the applicant must describe and demonstrate how students will benefit from the faculty’s professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning and subsequent success.

**Category 2: Joint Faculty-Student Public Service**

**Purpose** - To promote and support faculty and student involvement in public service. Projects are expected to result in significant service to external organizations, non-profit agencies, or target groups within the community or region. In addition, there should be an expectation of student and faculty growth in understanding community needs and the ways that participants can help meet those needs.

The proposal must address how it contributes to student success, i.e. the applicant must describe and demonstrate how students will benefit from the project or the faculty’s professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning and subsequent success.

**Special Stipulations** - Proposals involving development or implementation of courses incorporating “service-learning” may be submitted in this category.

**Category 3: Creative and Performing Arts**

**Purpose** - To support those activities and projects in the creative and the performing arts with demonstrated relevance for professional development. Projects are expected to result in juried presentations or exhibitions, public performances, publications, or some other recognized form appropriate to the particular field. The Council will not fund proposals that are aimed primarily at funding existing campus wide arts series, festivals or events that are historical to the university in any way.

The proposal must address how it contributes to student success, i.e. the applicant must describe and demonstrate how students will benefit from the faculty’s professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning and subsequent success.

If the primary effort in an arts proposal is research, the proposal may be submitted under Category 1. If the primary effort in an arts proposal is curriculum, instruction and assessment, the proposal can be submitted under Category 4. If the primary effort in an arts proposal is training and learning, the proposal may be submitted under Category 5.

**Category 4: Innovation in teaching and improvement in student learning outcomes**

**Purpose** - To explore innovative or alternative instructional methods (including effective use of technology); conduct classroom research; revise curricula; or develop assessment strategies intended to strengthen teaching and learning. The purpose is to provide professional development that is required to gain expertise in – to learn – innovative methods of teaching that improve student learning outcomes. The purpose promotes and supports opportunities for faculty to develop their skills in evidenced-based, highly effective methods of teaching and learning, and employing instructional materials and methods that have a convincing evidentiary basis of effectiveness, including but not limited to, more extensive use of modern laboratory methods, proven distance learning education methods (or hybrid) designs and improved approaches to motivating student interest and supporting students efforts to succeed, and develop assessment strategies intended to strengthen teaching and learning. In this Category, proposals involving professional development that will be applied to teaching large-enrollment, lower division classes and to developmental education, as well as STEM areas and teacher education are encouraged.
The proposal must address how it contributes to student success, i.e. the applicant must describe and demonstrate how students will benefit from the faculty's professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning and subsequent success.

This funding amount for Category 4 is a separate allocation of $50,000 which is prohibited from being used in other categories that can access the $300,000 annual grant funding and the $50,000 probationary faculty allocation.

**Special Stipulations**

1. Within this Category, the Council is focusing on professional development related to implementing innovations in teaching and improvement of student learning outcomes.

2. The proposal must identify how students will benefit from the work. Proposers should answer the following: How will this improve learning for others? How important is the contribution to student learning that the project promises?

3. Letter(s) of endorsement from the appropriate Dean(s) must be appended to proposals in Category 4. The letter(s) shall express congruence between the objectives of the faculty member(s) and those of the academic unit in regard to innovation in teaching and improvement of student success. Proposals submitted without the letter will not be considered.

**Category 5: Individual Career Enhancement**

**Purpose** - To support an individual faculty member's career enhancement. Career enhancement refers to enhancing knowledge, understanding, or skills that facilitate advancement, success, renewal, and fulfillment in the profession as it equates to increased student learning. Grants will be awarded to projects that clearly demonstrate how the faculty member will become better able to meet the current and/or long-range needs of the university and its strategic focus surrounding student success; enable a faculty member to develop or update skills and/or knowledge by working in an off-site academic or non-academic setting which provides unique opportunities related to the applicant's discipline or role as a faculty member. Such experience may contribute to knowledge and skills in the faculty member's current teaching area, a new area of interest, or a related field that broadens the individual's competence. Projects involving international travel to teach and/or conduct research or service activities for periods of a month or more (not for short conferences) are encouraged. Postdoctoral or other study for faculty members to expand their knowledge beyond their prior education or training to meet the changing needs in academic programming at their home university is supported. Proposals should indicate how the experience will contribute to the applicant's teaching, scholarship, or service.

The proposal must address how it contributes to student success, i.e. the applicant must describe and demonstrate how students will benefit from the faculty's professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning and subsequent success.

**Special Stipulations**

1. Requests may be made to cover costs of travel, lodging, and other direct costs incurred during the course of the proposed activity.

2. Requests may be made to help fund an alternative workload assignment during the academic year or a summer stipend of up to $2,000 per month for a maximum of two months, provided no compensation is received from an outside organization with whom the applicant will be working.

3. A letter of endorsement from the appropriate dean or department chair concerning the relationship between the proposed project and the university or unit goals must be included.
III. PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

PREPARATION OF THE PROPOSAL

The FPDC has strict limits on length of proposals. Required formats for certain parts of the proposal are also important to ensure clarity, consistency, and comparability. Please carefully observe the following instructions regarding FORMAT.

A. FORMAT GUIDELINES

1. The Grant proposal narrative including the budget summary and budget notes must not exceed six pages, single-spaced. (Use the content guidelines provided on pages 9-11 to order the narrative.)

2. Only the following items do not count in the six-page narrative limit:
   a. The title page and required two-page PI and co-PI curriculum vitae;
   b. A short list of references (not to exceed one page);
   c. A one-page summary of any previous FPDC grant(s) received by the Project Director;
   d. Letters of endorsement only if required in the particular RFP category for which the proposal is being submitted; and
   e. A copy of the title page and signatures page of any contract directly related to your project (e.g., with a publisher). No other appendices should be included.

3. Page set-up requirements: The font size used in the proposal must be no smaller than the font size on this page (11 pt). Margins may be no less than one inch. This applies to attachments as well.

4. All pages of the narrative (including budget) must be numbered, preferably at the bottom.

5. The FPDC membership represents a variety of disciplines; care should be taken to avoid disciplinary jargon as much as possible. Write in a non-technical style and language. When technical terms are unavoidable, a short (one sentence, parenthetical or footnote) explanation is encouraged.

6. Check and re-check the budget instructions to be sure that your proposed budget is in compliance and follows the format given on page 16 of these guidelines. Verify that the amount requested from the FPDC listed on the proposal title page is accurate and agrees with the amount listed as the total in the first column of the budget sheet.

7. Examine your proposal carefully, and check your addition on the budget page. Care should be taken to ensure that all pages of the original proposal appear in the file transmitted by e-mail and that any necessary SIGNED support letters are attached as PDF files.

B. CONTENT GUIDELINES

Some categories call for additional information (see page 6 to 8), but the following must be included in all grant proposals:

1. The title page in the required format (page 15). Be sure to include project title and RFP category. The title should clearly indicate academic purpose/intent to a lay reader. Co-Project Directors must be listed. (NOTE: all correspondence pertaining to the proposal will be sent only to the first person listed who will be held accountable for submitting the final project and financial reports if a grant is awarded.) The title page also includes a one-paragraph abstract (approximately 150 words) of the proposal written in non-technical language and provides spaces for required endorsement signatures.

2. Endorsement signatures of the university faculty professional development committee chair (representing the full committee) and the university provost (or designee) on the title page are required.
Prosals involving faculty from more than one university must carry the endorsement signatures of the faculty professional development committee chair and provost only of the Project Director's university.

3. **Project narrative** – The narrative should be concise but include sufficient information to permit effective review by a multi-disciplinary group. Language should be non-technical in nature. Be specific and informative; avoid redundancy. All narratives must include the following sections:

   a. **Background and Significance** (approximately 1 page) –
      - Briefly sketch the background of the present proposal.
      - Evaluate existing knowledge or practice (what others have found or done).
      - Specifically identify the gaps or needs which the project intends to fill.
      - If you have performed previous work related to the proposal, describe previous findings or outcomes.
      - Clearly state your view of the proposed project's significance.
      - Articulate how students will benefit from the faculty's professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning; any change in class instruction or change in classroom learning outcomes; or other student outcomes.

   b. **Goals and Objectives** (approximately 1/3 to 1/2 page) –
      - List your broad long-term goals (including professional development goals), and
      - Provide a point-by-point listing of the specific objectives to be addressed in the proposed project.

   c. **Description of Project** (approximately 2 pages) –
      - Describe the design of your project and the procedures to be used or activities to be engaged in to accomplish your specific objectives.
      - If appropriate, include the means by which data will be collected, analyzed, and interpreted.
      - Provide a tentative sequence or timeline for the work.
      - Include at least one paragraph on dates/timelines of critical events and discrete phases of the project.
      - Your description may be divided into further sub-sections for clarity.

   d. **Expected Outcomes** (approximately 1/2 page) –
      - List expected outcomes, including what you expect to learn and what others will learn, including the ultimate impact on student success.
      - Explain how the grant will enhance your professional development in one paragraph.
      - Explain any plans for continuing the project beyond the grant period.
      - Describe means of application, and/or dissemination of findings or results.

   e. **Project Evaluation** – (approximately 1 page)
      - Describe your method of measurement for all outcomes.
      - How you will evaluate your project success

   f. **Project Budget** – (approximately 1 page)
      - The final page of the narrative must include the budget presented in the required table format (page 16)
      - Budget Notes that explain exactly how budget figures were calculated and how grant funds will be used.
      - Check addition to be sure totals are correct.

4. **Assurance of compliance with university research requirements** – It is the responsibility of the Project Director and the submitting university to assure compliance with all university research requirements
(e.g., Human Subjects Research, Animal Welfare, Conflict of Interest, Integrity in Research) if applicable to the proposed project. Proposals must reflect the Project Director’s awareness that approval from particular review bodies is needed (or not) and must indicate the timeline for securing such approval in the project narrative.

5. A summary 2-page curriculum vitae or resume for the Project Director and co-Project Director must be appended to the proposal. The vita should include only information relevant to the proposal and must not exceed two pages.

6. References – A full review of literature is not expected, but any sources cited or of particular relevance to the proposal must be listed in an appendix limited to one page. Short in-text references are also desired.

7. Previous FPDC grants and outcomes – Append a list of all previous grants consisting of no more than one page listing the year, title, category of previous grants, and briefly indicate project outcomes.

8. Proposals in RFP Category 4 and 5 must append Letters of endorsement from an appropriate dean or department chair. In these cases, the letter is expected to affirm congruence between the objectives of the faculty member(s) and those of the academic unit. In RFP categories with this requirement, proposals submitted without the letter will not be considered.

9. Any other contract documents. (Described on page 12, item 15.)

BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS

The project budget must include all anticipated expenses and revenue. Wherever possible, projected expenses should be based on estimates provided by suppliers or appropriate university offices. Applicants are expected to exercise prudence and request funds only for essential costs that cannot be covered otherwise. The following instructions pertain to specific budget items. All amounts should be rounded to the nearest dollar.

1. Reassigned Time – If a project budget includes funds for replacement faculty to subsidize equivalency (reassigned time) for participating faculty, no more than the actual amount required for replacement at the instructor level (Q01 Step 1) will be paid. If an alternative workload assignment for a particular faculty member does not require replacement, funds for that purpose should not be requested.

2. Summer Stipends – The Council will award no more than $2,000 per faculty member per month for up to two months during the summer. Summer stipends are intended to relieve faculty of the financial need to teach during the summer; the maximum stipend assumes full-time work on the project during the time period for which it is granted. Lower summer stipends should be requested if the faculty member(s) will not be devoting fulltime to the project during the funded period. In any case, justification in terms of time and effort, i.e. the amount of work, to be accomplished during the summer must be provided.

3. Other Stipends – Except in very unusual circumstances, the Council will not provide funds to pay stipends to System faculty for participation in professional development activities, such as workshops, retreats, etc. Nor will the FPDC approve use of grant funds to pay basic education teachers for participation in funded projects or to pay for substitutes for such teachers.

4. Student Wages – The exact nature of work to be performed by students should be indicated either in the proposal narrative or the Budget Notes. Requests for student hourly wages that exceed Pennsylvania’s minimum wage are allowed but must include justification in terms of university policy and/or the nature of the work to be performed by students. Clearly indicate how much students will be paid and for how many hours.

5. Fringe Benefits – Funds to cover fringe benefits for summer stipends, replacement faculty, graduate assistants, student wages, or any other compensation to individuals will not be included in grant awards.
Because of the variability in amounts required for benefits and the fact that accurate estimates cannot always be made in advance, the universities are asked to cover benefit costs where needed. Estimated costs for benefits, including benefits required for summer stipends, should be included in the University Contribution column of the budget summary.

6. **Honoraria** – The FPDC will award **no more than $750 per day per person** for honoraria for external consultants or presenters. The university may contribute additional funding for honoraria if desired. Proposals should indicate the qualifications to be sought in a consultant or presenter or, preferably, include the names and credentials of the person(s) to be invited. Where appropriate expertise exists within the State System, the use of System colleagues is encouraged.

7. **Supplies** – These are consumable items required to carry out the project.

8. **Equipment** – Total requests for equipment, books, computer software, or similar items **not to exceed $3,000** will be considered, provided that the proposal offers strong justification related to the needs of the project. Any such items purchased with FPDC grant funds will be the property of the university.

9. **Operating Expenses** – These include expenses for surveys (including paper and postage), off-site facility costs, housing and other items typically treated as direct costs, as well as refreshments or other costs associated with meetings that may be part of the project. Items that are typically treated as indirect costs cannot be charged to the grant.

10. **Research Travel** – Estimates of travel expenses included in project budgets should conform to University travel-expense regulations. Travel monies should be requested only for travel that is directly related to the proposed project and that would not ordinarily be covered from the departmental or university budget. Funding requested to cover the costs of extended stays (a week or more) in another location should not include food costs unless these are included in a seminar or institute package price.

11. **(NEW) Conference Travel**- Travel to present a paper on the results of the funded project will be allowed, **not to exceed $1,000 per project**, for any/all project personnel, including students, to present results of the funded project (only) within the mandatory end date of the project with no extensions allowed solely for presentation travel.

12. **Indirect Costs** – The Council does not fund overhead or indirect costs such as accounting, university space, clerical support, or legal.

13. **University Contribution** – To gauge the feasibility of a proposed project—whether or not its goals can be accomplished—the Council requires information about additional funding, including any university contribution that has been committed to the project. University matching funds are not required and do not affect selection. In the Budget Summary, please list only specific dollar amounts, if any, pledged to the particular project by the university or from other sources. It is assumed that in-kind support (e.g., some clerical support, copying, etc.) will be provided in many cases; in-kind support may be mentioned in Budget Notes, but estimates of the monetary value of this support should **not** be included in the Budget Summary.

The signature of the provost or designee on the title page will be understood as confirmation of amounts listed in the University Contribution column. Universities have different procedures for verifying funding commitments; the campus committee and/or grants officer should be able to provide information in this regard.

14. **Other Revenue Sources** – Estimated or actual funds pledged or anticipated from external sources should be listed in this column of the budget format; these sources should be identified in the Budget Notes.

15. **Contracts** – Proposals that involve a contract for a book or other materials to be prepared as part of the project must append a copy of the contract’s title page and signature page ONLY. Advance payments
from the contractor should be included in the Project Budget under Other Revenue Sources; anticipated royalties need not be listed as part of the Budget Summary, but an estimate should be included in the Budget Notes.

16. The required format for the budget summary appears on page 16.
IV. POST AWARD INSTRUCTIONS

Upon award of the funds by the FPDC, the Office of the Chancellor will prepare and issue Letters of Understanding (LOUs) with the awardees' universities. The LOUs will incorporate by reference the terms and conditions of this Request for Proposal.

During project implementation, requests for budget revisions, extensions or other project changes will be managed according to the Council's policy on post-award proposal/project revisions, with the following exception for minor budget revisions:

- Universities may revise the line items in a budget up to a maximum of 10% of the original award amount without PASSHE approval. For example, a grant of $5,000 may have cumulative line item revisions up to and including $500.00 with only notification to their campus' grant and accounting offices. This does not mean a project director can over-expend the grant award by 10%.

- Budget revisions that exceed 10% must be submitted to PASSHE.

- Please note that ANY budget revision may not exceed the line item limitations listed in the budget instructions.

EXTENSIONS. In order to secure an extension, a Project Director must submit a request that outlines the reasons an extension is needed, i.e. the delay in the completion of the planned scope of the project. A Project Director can request as much time as needed to compensate for prior delays, but no more than one year. A Project Director can receive no additional money; but the balance of the awarded grant will remain available for budgeted expenses. A project cannot be extended simply because there is a balance of funds or to expand the scope of the original project. There must be a legitimate reason directly related to the planned scope of the original project. Extensions are not allowed solely to expend funds to travel to make presentations.

BUDGET REVISIONS. A request for a budget revision should include an explanation of the reasons for the shift in funds and a description of the impact on the project. Identify reasons the revision is necessary to accomplish the project objectives and reasons the funds are not needed in the original budget category.

All requests for revisions or extensions can be submitted to Asmith-aumen@passhe.edu
REQUIRED FORMAT FOR TITLE PAGE OF PROPOSAL

University Proposal #

FOR PASSHE OFFICE USE ONLY: FPDC proposal #

Project Title:

RFP Category: Total Grant Amount Requested from FPDC:

Discipline: Sub-Discipline:

Project Director (name, position, department, university, telephone number, and e-mail address):

Faculty Status (see definitions below):

☐ Tenured ☐ Probationary ☐ Non-Tenure Track

Other Participants (names, departments, e-mail addresses):

IRB/IACUC Status: ☐ Approved (Protocol # ) ☐ Pending ☐ N/A

ABSTRACT (one paragraph of approximately 150 words in non-technical language):

Endorsement: ________________________________ Date
Chair, University Faculty Professional Development Committee

Endorsement: ________________________________ Date
University Provost or designee

Faculty Status Definitions:
Probationary Non-Tenured Faculty - a faculty member who is appointed to a tenure track position and who has not been granted tenure.
Non-Tenure Track Faculty - a faculty member who is appointed to service in a position in which service will not be credited toward tenure, for example Temporary Part-Time or Temporary Full-Time or Regular Part-Time faculty.
REQUIRED FORMAT FOR BUDGET SUMMARY

Round off all numbers to the nearest dollar, and list only whole dollar amounts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Grant</th>
<th>University Contribution</th>
<th>Other Revenue Sources</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries/Stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria (for consultants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

* This figure is the total grant amount requested from the FPDC and must be listed on the title page of the proposal. Check addition carefully.

**Reassigned Time** – If a project budget includes funds for replacement faculty to subsidize equivalency (reassigned time) for participating faculty, no more than the actual amount required for replacement at the instructor level (Q01 Step 1) will be paid. If an alternative workload assignment for a particular faculty member does not require replacement, funds for that purpose should not be requested.

**Budget Notes** – Provide supporting detail for all budget items. Show how particular amounts were calculated.
CHECK LIST FOR PROPOSAL WRITERS (AND CAMPUS SCREENING COMMITTEES)

This checklist is NOT to be submitted with the proposal.

Read and carefully follow the Council's General Information and Guidelines along with the individual Request for Proposals information.

☐ Does your proposal meet the eligibility requirements on page 2-3 of the guidelines? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Does your title page follow the required format and include: ___ tenure status, ___Abstract, ___IRB/IACUC and ___correct RFP category? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Does your proposal stay within the length prescribed by the FPDC Guidelines (Narrative and Budget summary no more than 6 pages)? Are your pages numbered? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Is your Budget Summary and Format (page 16) in compliance with the Budget Instructions? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Does the figure listed on your title page for Total Grant Amount Requested from the FPDC correspond to the total of the first column in your Budget Summary? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Do the amounts entered on your budget table add up to the total you are requesting from the FPDC? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Do you fully explain and provide supporting details for each budget line in Budget Notes? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Does your budget comply with specific cost item limits for release time, fringe benefits, honoraria, equipment, travel, all outlined on pages 11-13? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Do you limit your appendices to those specifically allowed (listed as acceptable) and/or required in your category? Yes ___ No ___

☐ If you have previously received an FPDC grant(s), have you listed the year, project title, and outcomes in a one-page appendix? Yes ___ No ___ Have you submitted your final report? Yes ___ No ___ (This is an eligibility requirement.)

☐ Are the required curriculum vitae attached and within two page limit for each PI & co-PI? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Is the required one-page listing of references attached as an appendix? Yes ___ No ___

☐ If your proposal is submitted in Categories 4 or 5, have you included the required institutional letter of endorsement? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Is your proposal written in non-technical language? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Are the goals or anticipated outcomes of your proposed project clearly stated? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Have you spelled out the project's anticipated professional development benefits? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Have you indicated briefly what you and/or others have accomplished previously in relation to the purpose of your project (if applicable)? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Does the proposal indicate what will be done, when it will be done (i.e. a timeline), and by whom? Yes ___ No ___

☐ Do you discuss the status or need for IRB or IACUC approval and the timeline for such approval? Yes ___ No ___

Please examine your proposal carefully before sending it. Revisions will NOT be allowed.

PROPOSALS THAT DO NOT MEET THE GUIDELINES OR DO NOT INCLUDE REQUIRED DOCUMENTS WILL NOT BE REVIEWED.
Faculty Professional Development Council (FPDC) Grants
Council Member Review Form (rev 6.12.18)

PASSHE PROPOSAL #: __________________________ DATE: __________
INVESTIGATOR(S) NAME(S): __________________________
NAME OF UNIVERSITY: __________________________
REVIEWER'S NAME: __________________________

Please refer to the rubric & guide for interpretation of the review criteria. A Proposal MUST score a minimum of 3 on every criterion.

Is the proposal in the Correct CATEGORY? A subcommittee majority makes this determination Yes ___ No ___

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Please Mark (X) only one number or score for each criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT OBJECTIVES &amp; OUTCOMES (Factor 1)</td>
<td>Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Exemplary X3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE &amp;/or CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD (Factor 2)</td>
<td>Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Exemplary X1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT SUCCESS (Factor 3)</td>
<td>Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Exemplary X3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Factor 4)</td>
<td>Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Exemplary X5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY/CREATIVE PROCESS (Factor 5)</td>
<td>Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Exemplary X3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET (Factor 6)</td>
<td>Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Exemplary X1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probationary Faculty _____ Yes ____ No

TOTAL SCORE (possible Maximum Weighted Score is 80) __________

IRB/IACUC Requirements (Please Check): [ ] Approved [ ] Pending [ ] Missing [ ] Not Applicable
Comments: ____________________________________________

______________________________________________________

______________________________________________________
INSTRUCTIONS TO CAMPUS COMMITTEES FOR ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

Each proposal and all documents related to that proposal must be forwarded in an e-mail transmittal which is sent only by the Chair of the FPD committee or the University Grants Officer. That is, a university submitting three grant proposals will send three e-mails, transmitting each individually (see Part III for additional guidance). Note: the FPDC Proposal mailbox address is to be used only for forwarding proposals. Questions or inquiries sent to this address will NOT receive a response. Any questions or inquiries should be sent to Angela Smith-Aumen at: asmith-aumen@passhe.edu.

Submitters should check the original proposal against the files you are e-mailing to ensure there are no missing pages. Verify that references, c.v.’s, support letters and/or information related to previous grants awarded by the FPDC to this project director are included. Verify the amount requested from the FPDC listed on the proposal title page agrees with the amount listed as the total in the first column of the budget sheet. Be sure all numbers listed in the budget add up correctly.

An acceptable e-mail transmittal which submits the proposal should conform to the following format:

One PDF file containing the entire required contents of the proposal.

Guidelines for Naming Files for Electronic Submission. The file name should state the RFP Category, the researcher’s name, the researcher’s University, the University proposal #, and the file contents as follows—

- RFP Category: use the number from the categories in the RFP on pages 6-8, e.g. 1A
- Researcher’s name: use the first four characters of the surname
- Researcher’s University: use a three character designation, e.g. MAN for Mansfield, ESU for East Stroudsburg
- Proposal # assigned by University – should be a number 1 through 3

Here are examples of the above:
1A-SMIT-LHU1
1B-JONE-ESU3
2-FREE-MAN2

- Send each email via delivery receipt & read receipt requested.

POST-SUBMISSION QUALITY CONTROL

IMMEDIATELY AFTER SENDING ALL PROPOSALS, PLEASE CHECK YOUR “SENT MAIL” FOLDER TO ENSURE TRANSMITTAL. ALSO, OPEN EACH “SENT” FILE AND VERIFY ITS COMPLETENESS. IF YOU DISCOVER ERRORS OR OMISSIONS IN YOUR FILES, IMMEDIATELY SEND CORRECTED FILES TO THE FPDC MAILBOX. THIS EFFORT WILL PREVENT DISTRIBUTION OF INCOMPLETE ELECTRONIC FILES TO PEER REVIEWERS AND COUNCIL MEMBERS, WHICH WILL LIKELY DISQUALIFY THE PROPOSAL.
GUIDE TO THE FPDC REVIEW FORM & RUBRIC

Components of the Review Form
The FPDC Review Form is comprised of the following pieces of information: a) PASSHE-assigned Proposal Number; b) Investigator(s) Name(s); c) Investigator(s) Institution(s); d) Reviewer’s Initials; e) Date of Review of Proposal; f) Six Review Criteria or Factors; g) Five-point Evaluation Scale with Operational Definitions of each Review Criteria; h) Institutional Review Board (IRB) Need, and i) Open-ended Review Comments.

Pre-screen. Is the Proposal in the correct category? The majority of members of the FPDC sub-committee must agree that the proposal is in the correct category. However, some distinctions between categories are subjective (e.g. joint faculty-student projects) and a close reading and a careful discussion of the proposal is necessary to make an informed judgment. If the majority of the Council Subcommittee believes the proposal is NOT in the correct category, it should be disqualified without finalizing a score. NO POINTS or weight are awarded for this criterion.

Review Criteria. All complete FPDC grant applications will be evaluated using the following six criteria:

- Project Objectives & Outcomes
- Project Significance &/or Contribution to the Field
- Student Outcomes
- Professional Development
- Research Methodology
- Budget

Operational Definitions of each Review Criterion or Factor are explained on the RUBRIC FOR FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (FPDC) GRANTS with a Five-point Evaluation Scale. Each of the six review criteria in the complete FPDC grant proposal is evaluated based on a five-point scale; with 1 indicating Poor and 5 indicating Exemplary.

Interpreting the Rubric.
Before using the FPDC Rubric to score each applicant’s proposal, the reviewer should become very familiar with its contents. In employing the FPDC Rubric to evaluate each proposal, it’s strongly recommended to start from the bottom of the instrument (equivalent to a rating of one) and proceed upwards (until a maximum possible rating of five). Faculty applicant must demonstrate that the statements identified within each level of each Review Criterion are all applicable or not applicable before proceeding upwards to the next scale or level. For example, if an applicant has met all the indicators or statements identified at level 1 for “Project Objectives & Outcomes”, then the Reviewer should proceed to the level 2 to determine if he/she has met all indicators, and so on. If an applicant has met all indicators in levels 1, 2, 3, 4, but not 5, then he/she should receive a maximum score of 4 for that particular Review Criterion. Prospective and successful investigators, in achieving a maximum score of 5, must fulfill ALL of the performance indicators or operational definitions contained within each of the Review Criteria or Factors. A Proposal must receive a minimum score of 3 on every Criterion in order to be considered eligible for funding.

Multiply the score of 1 to 5 by the weight to arrive at the weighted score for each factor. Total Score is the sum of the weighted score column. Add 5 points if the Project Director is probationary faculty (see proposal title page). The total possible or maximum score that an applicant can receive, after weighting, is 80.
### RUBRIC FOR FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (FPDC) GRANTS
(Council Member Review)

**REVIEW CRITERIA** (rev. 06/06/18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>Factor 1: PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES</th>
<th>Factor 2: PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE and/or CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD</th>
<th>Factor 3: STUDENT OUTCOMES</th>
<th>Factor 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>Factor 5: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY/CREATIVE PROCESS</th>
<th>Factor 6: BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> (Exemplary)</td>
<td>- Proposal is in the correct category Check if true</td>
<td>- All the project objectives are very specific (well-defined), clearly measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe. - All project outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives.</td>
<td>- Literature review is very clear and comprehensive, indicative of the current state of the art. - Project contributions or significance are very clearly stated. - Proposal substantiates the project contributions or significance is very important, valuable to the discipline and/or addresses a gap in research.</td>
<td>- Student success and outcomes are very clear, well demonstrated</td>
<td>Project will significantly enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large.</td>
<td>Methodology/process is well stated, very appropriate and very comprehensive. - It is very likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based upon the methodology. - The Project (i.e. the research idea or concept) itself is very rational/logical throughout. - Named personnel have the expertise and exemplary abilities (i.e. background knowledge &amp; skills) to complete the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>- Majority of the objectives are very specific, clearly measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe. - Majority of the outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives.</td>
<td>- Literature review is clear and comprehensive, indicative of the current state of the art. - Project contributions or significance are well stated. - Proposal substantiates the project contributions or significance is important, valuable to the discipline and/or addresses a gap in research.</td>
<td>- Student success and outcomes are clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>- Major objectives are clear and relevant to the project and the discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>- Proposal is in the correct category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- Check if true: True
- Exemplary: True
- Comprehensive: True
- Reasonable: True
- Justified: True
- Relevant: True
- Essential: True
- Professional: True
- Development: True
- Methodology: True
- Creative Process: True
- Budget: True

**Page 1 of 3**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (Good)</td>
<td>Some objectives are specific, measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe.</td>
<td>• Literature review is somewhat clear, current and comprehensive, indicative of the current state of the art. • Project contributions or significance are somewhat well-stated. • Proposal substantiates project contributions or significance somewhat important, valuable to the discipline and/or addresses a gap in research. • Student success and outcomes are somewhat clear. Project may enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large. • Methodology/process is understandable, appropriate and adequate. • It is somewhat likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based on the proposed methodology. • Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) lacks rationale/logic in limited areas. • Named personnel have the required basic abilities (i.e. background knowledge &amp; skills) to complete the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some objectives are stated but are not specific or measurable or demonstrable, or attainable within the timeframe. Majority of outcomes do not relate to the project goals and objectives.</td>
<td>• Literature review is vague, contains some minor omissions; not indicative of the current state of the art. • Project contributions or significance are vaguely stated. • Proposal substantiates project contributions or significance may be somewhat important, somewhat valuable to the discipline and/or might address a gap in research. • Student success and outcomes are not clear. Project is not likely to enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large. • Methodology/process is incomplete and not understandable. • It is barely likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based upon proposed methodology. • Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) lacks rationale/logic throughout. • Named personnel have some relevant abilities, but lack important aspects (i.e. background knowledge &amp; skills) to complete the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Poor)</td>
<td>Proposal is NOT in the correct category. Check if true.</td>
<td>• No project objectives are stated. • No project outcomes are stated. • Objectives are very vague. • Outcomes are very vague. • Objectives are clearly not attainable in the project timeframe. • Literature review is very vague and omits key information; not indicative of the current state of the art. • Project contributions or significance are very vague or are omitted. • Proposal does not substantiate project contributions or significance, value to the discipline and/or it addresses a gap in research. • Student success and outcomes are not evident. Contribution of project to author's professional development is very vague or omitted entirely. • Methodology/process is very vague or omitted. • It is not likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based on omission of, or vaguely stated, methodology. • Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) is not at all rational/logical. • Named personnel lack any relevant ability (i.e. background knowledge &amp; skills) to complete the project. • Budget is unreasonable in all areas. • Costs are not justified in the budget narrative or notes. • Some costs are partly relevant and essential to this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Score | Description | Comments |

| 0 | | |
LEXICON:
Objectives are statements of what the Project Director (PD) intends to accomplish and which are measurable.

Outcomes are the results or accomplishments of the project and are therefore directly reflective of the objectives.

PI is the Principal Investigator or Project Director. In evaluating expertise and skill, one includes co-Principal Investigators and co-Project Directors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>FPDC Category</th>
<th>PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES</th>
<th>PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE and/or CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD</th>
<th>STUDENT OUTCOMES</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (Exemplary)</td>
<td>Pre-screen</td>
<td>• Proposal is in the correct category Check if true</td>
<td>• All the project objectives are very specific (well-defined), clearly measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe. • All project outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives.</td>
<td>• Community need is very clear, well demonstrated • Project contributions or significance are very clearly stated • A lit review confirms the services reflect current best practices in the field; are very appropriate to address the need.</td>
<td>Student success and outcomes are very clear, well demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Majority of objectives are very specific, clearly measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe. Majority of the outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives.</td>
<td>Community need is clear • Project contributions or significance are well stated • A lit review confirms the services reflect current best practices in the field; are appropriate to address the need.</td>
<td>Student success and outcomes are clear</td>
<td>Project will enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Good)</td>
<td>Factor 2 for Public Service (Category 2 only)</td>
<td>Some objectives are specific, measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe. Some outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives.</td>
<td>Community need is somewhat clear • Project contributions or significance are somewhat well stated • A lit review confirms the services reflect current best practices in the field; are appropriate to address the need.</td>
<td>Student success and outcomes are somewhat clear</td>
<td>Project may enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Some objectives are stated but are not specific or measurable or demonstrable, or attainable within the timeframe. Some outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives.</td>
<td>Community need is not clear • Project contributions or significance are not clear • A lit review is vague and the services may not reflect current best practices in the field; are not clear.</td>
<td>Student success and outcomes are not clear</td>
<td>Project is not likely to enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Poor)</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>Proposal is NOT in the correct category Check if true</td>
<td>No project objectives are stated. No project outcomes are stated. Objectives are very vague. Outcomes are very vague. Objectives are clearly not attainable in the project timeframe.</td>
<td>Community need is not evident • Project contributions or significance are not stated; not impactful • A lit review is missing or insufficient to draw any conclusions if the services are appropriate or will impact on the need.</td>
<td>Contribution of project to author's professional development is very vague or omitted entirely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATING</td>
<td>PROJECT METHODOLOGY (Category 2 only)</td>
<td>Factor 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 (Exemplary) | • Methodology, procedures, activities are well stated, appropriate and very comprehensive  
• It is very likely the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs'.  
• The project itself is very rational, logical throughout | • Budget is comprehensive and reasonable.  
• All costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes.  
• All costs are relevant and essential to this project. |
| 4              | • Methodology, procedures, activities are understandable, appropriate and comprehensive       
• It is likely the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs'  
• The project itself is rational/logical | • Budget is comprehensive and reasonable.  
• Majority of costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes.  
• Majority of costs are relevant and essential to this project. |
| 3 (Good)   | • Methodology, procedures, activities are understandable, appropriate and adequate         
• It is somewhat likely the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs'  
• The project itself lacks rationality/logic in limited areas | • Budget is comprehensive and reasonable.  
• Some costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes.  
• Some costs are relevant and essential to this project. |
| 2              | • Methodology, procedures, activities are incomplete and not understandable or appropriate    
• It is barely likely the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs'  
• The project itself lacks rational/logic throughout | • Budget is not comprehensive and reasonable.  
• Costs are partly justified in the budget narrative or notes.  
• Some costs are partly relevant and essential to this project. |
| 1 (Poor)    | • Methodology, procedures, activities are very vague or omitted.                            
• It is not likely that the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs'.  
• Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) is not at all rational/logical. | • Budget is unreasonable in all areas.  
• Costs are not justified in the budget narrative or notes.  
• Many costs are not relevant and essential to this project. |

LEXICON:

Objectives are statements of what the Project Director (PD) intends to accomplish and which are measurable.

Outcomes are the results or accomplishments of the project and are therefore directly reflective of the objectives.

PI is the Principal Investigator or Project Director. In evaluating expertise and skill, one includes co-Principal Investigators and co-Project Directors.
(To use this form, click on File/Save As/ and save this file as a Word document on your computer. You can then fill in the form text boxes by clicking on each one and typing your information in the box.)

Project Information:

Project Title:

Project Director:

University:

Amount of Grant:

II. Grant Category: (click on the box to select one)

- 1A Joint Faculty-Student Research
- 1B Scholarly Research
- 1C Scholarly Research: Non-tenured Scholars
- 2 Joint Faculty-Student Public Service
- 3 Creative and Performing Arts
- 4A Individual Projects: Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment
- 4B Group Projects: Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment
- 4C Academic Departments: Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment
- 5 Individual Career Enhancement: Off-site settings

III. Outcomes/Benefits of Project: (click on all boxes that apply)

- Publication
- Presentation: by Faculty
- Presentation: by Faculty-Student; Student
- Performance
- Skills Development/Enhancement
- Public Service
- Curriculum Development/Enhancement
- Instructional/Pedagogical
- Assessment
- Other (please describe)

IV. Number of Participants (identify those directly involved in the implementation of the project):

Students:

Faculty:

Other (please identify):

V. Summary of Project Activities:

VI. Summary of Project Outcomes

a. Student Success Outcomes:

1. Recite proposed contribution to student success from your original proposal:
2. Identify progress and/or outcomes related to the project's contribution to student development/learning/success:

3. **Number of students** that will benefit from the project results (e.g. students typically enrolled in a directly impacted class or activity)
   a. within one year: _________
   b. in future years: _________

b. **Other Outcomes.** Check the outcomes expected for the project and describe the actual results. List specific publications, articles, presentations, consultations, etc., which are a direct result of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME:</th>
<th>RESULT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>□ in preparation □ in press □ published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter name/issue, date:

| Presentation | □ university or local □ statewide □ national □ international |

Enter conference name/date:

| Consultations | Please describe: |

□ Other

Explanation: