Office of Research & Economic Development Internal Funding Programs

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 2024-2025, five awards will be made of up to $25,000 each.

We received 21 pre-proposals, which have undergone an initial review that resulted in eleven applicants being invited to submit a full proposal.

During the full proposal review, the internal reviewers recruited for that step will read all proposals. You 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 reviews and ranks.

Instructions to Reviewers

Since only five awards can be made, it is important that reviewers rigorously apply the evaluation criteria given below while performing the reviews. **Reviewers should be selective, and use the full range of criteria scores.**

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

Additionally, reviewers should reference the program guidelines for application structure or additional questions regarding the nature of the applications.

Given the interdisciplinary nature of both applications and reviewers, applicants are instructed to writer their proposals in language that can be understood by an educated non-expert. You will find that applicants vary in their successful execution of this instruction.

As part of our instructions to all reviewer panels, we now include a document on "Guidance on Mitigating Bias in Reviews." It is based on a document developed and published by the University of Michigan. We very much appreciate the job that our reviewers do for us, and we know you strive to

REVIEW DEADLINE

January 26, 2024 @ 11:59pm

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.

do your best. We also believe that we can all try to continuously improve in order to mitigate our implicit and explicit biases and provide the best reviews we can for our applicants.

Conflict of Interest

For conflict of interest on internal reviews, being a member of the same department does not automatically disallow a review. Current close collaboration, such as being co-PIs on a proposal, or being longtime close collaborators, are disqualifying conflicts in many cases. The same goes for any kind of shared financial interest, either professional or personal, as well as personal relationships such as marriage or kinship. If you have questions about what constitutes a conflict of interest for the purposes of this competition, please contact ajordan@southalabama.edu or 251.460.6507.

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 w. milestones; external funding sources 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 criteria reviews 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 1-11; *these are NOT scores*. There should be no 'ties' between applicants, e.g. for the number one spot.

APPLICANT FEEDBACK: One text box is provided for applicant feedback. Applicants do not see the comments you provide for criteria reviews since those are intended for use during the review process. You are welcome to use those comments (e.g. by copying them in), but a separate field is provided so you can edit them or provide additional comments that are not relevant to the individual criteria.