

Office of Research & Economic Development Internal Funding Programs



Matthew Reichert | 251.460.6628 | reichert@southalabama.edu
 Angela Jordan | 251.460.6507 | ajordan@southalabama.edu

Overview

The Research and Scholarship Development Grant (RSDG) is an internal funding program that accepts applications from all units except the College of Medicine. In 2020, five awards will be made of up to \$25,000 each.

This year, applications will undergo an initial screening to select around nine applications that will receive a full review. Three reviewers were recruited for the screening step. They are asked to consider the merit of the applications in light of the program guidelines and evaluation criteria provided below. Note that nine proposals for full review is a recommended quantity, and screeners may recommend more or less than that number depending on the quality of the applications.

During the full review, the five reviewers recruited for that step will read all the proposals put forward by the screening panel. They are asked to consider the merit of the applications in light of the program guidelines and evaluation criteria provided below. A panel meeting will be held to discuss the reviews and rankings.

Instructions to Reviewers

20 applications were received for the 2020 competition. Since only five can be selected as awardees, it is important that reviewers rigorously apply the evaluation criteria given below while performing the reviews. Reviewers should be selective, and utilize the full range of criteria scores.

Reviewers will need to provide both a numeric score for each criteria, and constructive feedback for the applicants in the comment fields provided in InfoReady.

Additionally, reviewers will find it useful to reference the program guidelines for application structure.

REVIEW DEADLINE

April 15, 2020 @ 5pm

HOW TO DOWNLOAD

Log in to InfoReady at <https://southalabama.infoready4.com/>.

Under the “Reviews” tab is a button that allows you to “Download All Unreviewed Applications.”

USE THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

While reviewing, consult the evaluation criteria included in this document.

SUBMIT REVIEWS ONLINE

Reviews should be submitted for each proposal in InfoReady. Reviewers should use BOTH the numeric scoring for each criterion, AND also provide constructive feedback for applicants in the comments section.

Evaluation Criteria

INTELLECTUAL MERIT: To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts? What is the potential for the proposed activity to advance knowledge and understanding within the field or across different fields?

1 = Excellent. Certain potential; exceptionally creative, original and/or transformative.

2 = Very Good. Very likely potential; very creative, original and/or transformative.

3 = Good. Satisfactory potential; creative, original and/or transformative.

4 = Fair. Low potential; creative, original and/or transformative elements are lacking.

5 = Poor. No potential; not creative, original and/or transformative.

PERSONNEL AND ENVIRONMENT: Is the individual and/or the team qualified to conduct the proposed activities? Are resources and/or equipment necessary to complete the project available?

1 = Exceptional. Exceptional qualifications, excellent resources.

2 = Good. Well-qualified, significant resources.

3 = Satisfactory. Suitably qualified, adequate resources.

4 = Less than Minimal. Under qualified, not adequately resourced.

5 = None. Not qualified, no resources.

OUTCOMES AND POTENTIAL FOR EXTERNAL FUNDING: Are demonstrable outcomes clearly defined and a timeline, with milestones, provided? Has the PI identified potential sources of external support and presented a plan for securing external support?

1 = Excellent. Demonstrable outcomes, clear timeline with defined and reasonable milestones; external sources of funding pursued/planned.

2 = Very Good. Defined outcomes, clear timeline with milestones; external sources of funding identified.

3 = Good. Discernable outcomes, timeline with milestones, external sources of funding discussed.

4 = Fair. Outcomes discussed, timeline presented, brief/incomplete discussion of plans to seek external sources of funding.

5 = Poor. No outcomes or timeline presented, no mention of plans to seek external funding.

QUALITY OF PROPOSAL DOCUMENT: Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities and the approach/methodology well-reasoned? Is the proposal well-written and organized? Is the rational or driving hypothesis compelling? Is the budget appropriate for the proposed activities?

1 = Excellent. Great organization, compelling presentation, convincing methodology, no spelling/grammatical errors, tight work-scope to budget mapping.

2 = Very Good. Organized, well – reasoned and logical, very reasonable methodology, minor spelling/grammatical errors, tight work-scope to budget mapping.

3 = Good. Somewhat organized, reason and logic are discernable but could be better; methodology is suitable, several spelling/grammatical errors, loose/undefined work-scope to budget mapping.

4 = Fair. Disorganized, reason and logic are not discernable; methodology is confusing, distracting spelling/grammatical errors, budget documentation is confusing.

5 = Poor. Not organized, no logical presentation, methodology not presented or not suitable, unacceptable spelling/grammatical errors, unacceptable budget or no budget documents presented.

OVERALL RANK: Unlike the previous four review categories that ask you to consider the merits of the individual proposal, “Overall Rank” asks you to consider the proposal in relation to the other applications in the pool. You are asked to provide a UNIQUE RANK order for each application, with 1 being the strongest. Your rank should be based on a holistic evaluation of a proposal’s quality, relative to the other applications you have reviewed. While you are not being asked to consider a specific set of criteria for rank, you should have a rationale for your ranking that you are prepared to discuss at the review panel meeting. Again, each application should have a UNIQUE RANK ordered from 1-9; *these are NOT scores*. There should be no ‘ties’ between applicants, e.g. for the number one spot.