FSU Council on Research and Creativity

Criteria for Judging

**Small Grant Proposals**

**-- Reviewer Criteria --**

Below are the criteria each member of the CRC Small Grant Program (SGP) 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.

*\*\*Keep in mind that each section of the proposal text should be written in clear, concise language so that reviewers from any discipline will be able to understand what is being stated.\*\**

* **Project/Issue and Goals:**
* Is the project/issue the project will address important/significant in the PI’s area of research?
* Are the goals/objectives of the project clear?
* Is the proposal designed to allow for the completion of a project for which other funding is not available, and is clearly not supported by any other resources?
* **Research Methods/Creative Activities:**
* Are the research methods and/or creative activities appropriate in light of the goals/objectives of the project?
* **Significance of Intended Outcomes:**
* Are the intended project outcomes of potential importance/significance?
* **Anticipated External Funding:**
* Is it likely that the proposed research or creative activity will enhance the prospects for future external funding?
* Does the plan for seeking external funding seem reasonable?

 (*Note: As compared to several of the other CRC grant programs, there will be less emphasis in the Small Grant proposal review process on the eventual acquisition of external funding. However, this does not totally remove the need for external funding consideration.)*

* **Schedule of Project Activities:**
* Does the schedule of project activities seem realistic?
* Does the project schedule reflect no anticipated continuing commitment of funds, but rather the completion of a single, distinct activity?
* **Budget:**
* In reference to the Project Goals/Objectives and the Proposed Research Methods/Creative Activities, does the project budget seem reasonable?
* Does the budget fund a future completion objective, and not reimburse activity that has already occurred?
* **Department/College 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?
* **Professional Obligations:**
* Are the PI’s other professional obligations during the award period likely to interfere with his/her ability to successfully complete the project?

**Scoring Scale**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impact** | **Score** | **Descriptor** | **Additional Guidance or Strengths/Weaknesses\*** |
| High | **1** | Exceptional | Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses |
| **2** | Outstanding | Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses |
| **3** | Excellent | Very strong with only some minor weaknesses |
| Medium | **4** | Very Good | Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses |
| **5** | Good | Strong but with at least one moderate weakness |
| **6** | Satisfactory | Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses |
| Low | **7** | Fair | Some strengths but with at least one major weakness |
| **8** | Marginal | A few strengths and a few major weaknesses |
| **9** | Poor | Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses |

\* Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact

 Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact

 Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact

**-- 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 Small Grant Program Review Committee and will not be eligible for funding The CRC SGP Review Committee will not need to review the following items:

* **Eligibility**
* Is the PI eligible to apply for the CRC Small Grants Program?
* Has the PI received a SGP in the past two years?
* **Proposal Submission**
* Has the PI correctly completed all of the required forms?
	+ Was the Proposal Transmittal form properly completed within the portal? Have the Co-PI(s), if any, and their departments been indicated in the portal?
* 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)?
	+ Have any specialized Research Compliance Forms (animal or Human Subjects, conflict of interest, hazardous materials, etc.) been indicated and/or uploaded as required?
	+ Has the Past, Current, and Pending Grants section of the portal been properly completed?
	+ 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?
	+ Have the Curricula Vitae for the PI and Co-PI(s) been properly completed?
	+ Did the PI submit the proposal in time to meet the submission deadline? Did the Chair(s) and Dean(s) approve the proposal by their approval deadline?