FSU Council on Research and Creativity

Criteria for Judging
Arts & Humanities Program Enhancement Grant Proposals

Reviewer Criteria:
Below are the criteria each member of the CRC Arts & Humanities Program Enhancement Grant (AHPEG) Review Committee will use to assist them in (a) critiquing a proposal, (b) providing useful feedback to the PI, and (c) determining an overall score for the proposal.

1. **Project / issue and goals**: Is the issue the project will address important/significant in the PI's area of research? Are the goals/objectives of the project clear?
   - the scholarly and, where appropriate, the artistic merits of the proposed activity
   - the effect the project will have on advancing knowledge and understanding in the field represented by the proposed work
   - the relationship of the work to existing or planned institutional research and creative programs and capacities as a statement of how the proposed program would enhance the PI's research and creative activity at FSU
2. **Research methods/creative activities**: Are the research methods and/or creative activities appropriate in light of the goals/objectives of the project?
   - the vision, productivity, qualifications and capabilities of the project leader (and the rest of the team if appropriate):
   - the performance capabilities of the PI
   - where appropriate, the overall integration, coherence, and credibility of the efforts among disciplines and researchers who would carry out the proposed plan
3. **Significance of intended outcomes:** Are the intended project outcomes of potential importance/significance?
   - where appropriate, the potential and cultural significance of new and original works of art
   - where appropriate, the cultural enrichment impact of the project and performance
4. **Anticipated external funding:** Is it likely that the proposed research or creative activity will enhance the prospects for external funding? Do the plans for seeking external funding seem reasonable?
   - where appropriate, plans for long-term artistic, scientific and/or financial sustainability of the proposal based on increased external funding
5. **Schedule of project activities:** Does the schedule of project activities seem realistic?

- statement of the progress anticipated during the grant period and an intended schedule of completion of the plan, including start and completion dates, or publication, or performance
6. **Budget:** In light of the project goals/objectives and the proposed research methods/creative activities, does the project budget seem reasonable?
   - appropriate budget, duration, staffing of the project, purchases and capacity to utilize funds including contributions certified by Letters of Financial Support to be uploaded from contributors
   - appropriateness of instrumentation purchases (if any) for the work proposed
   - utilization of graduate assistants whenever possible or appropriate
7. **Department/College and potential external support:** If the PI's department and/or college will be providing any special or non-routine support for the project, is it likely that such support will contribute to the success of the project? Are external support plans described?
   - statement of available external resources to support proposed research and a statement describing the intent to apply to external entities
   - availability of any other existing support to leverage external funds in the future.
8. **Professional obligations**: Are the PI's other professional obligations during the award period likely to interfere with the PI's ability to successfully complete the project?
9. **Clarity of the proposal text:** Is each section of the proposal text written in clear, concise language, so that reviewers from any discipline will be able to understand it?

Program Coordinator Criteria:
Below are the criteria the CRC Program Coordinator will use to review each proposal. If any of these criteria are not met, the proposal will not be reviewed by the CRC Arts & Humanities Program Enhancement Grant Review Committee and will not be eligible for funding. Reviewers will not need to review the following items:

1. Is the PI eligible to apply for a CRC Arts & Humanities Program Enhancement Grant?
   a. Has the PI received an AHPEG in the past two years?
   b. Does the PI have a well-funded research program?

2. Has the PI correctly completed all of the required forms?
   a. Has the **Proposal Transmittal** been properly completed? Is there a list of Co-PIs and departments, if applicable?
   b. Is the length of the **abstract** no more than 250 words?
   c. Does the **Proposal text** include all of the required sections? Is each section properly titled and numbered? Is the length of the proposal text no more than 8 pages (not counting references and appendices)?

d. Have **Letters of Financial Support** detailed in the grant proposal attesting to cash, or in-kind services of contributors been uploaded to certify all such cited contributions?
e. Have any specialized **Research Compliance Forms** been uploaded as required? Human or animal subjects, DNA, RNA, hazardous materials, or marine lab facilities, for example: human subjects, animal research information, Environmental Health & Safety, or SRA forms or other compliance requirements that may apply to research or performance plans.
f. Has the **Past, Current and Pending Grants** been properly completed?
g. Has the **Proposal Budget** been properly completed? Is the proposed use of the award funds acceptable in light of the funding rules for this grant program?
h. Has the **Curriculum Vita** been properly completed?

3. Did the PI submit the proposal in time to meet the submission deadline?