

University Grants Committee Handout

Part IV University Grants Scoring Rubric

Category and Scoring	Description
<input type="checkbox"/> Eligible <input type="checkbox"/> Not eligible	Proposal is complete.
College and University Mission (10 points)	The applicant demonstrates that the project supports the mission and appropriate goals of the college and university.
Final Product (10 points)	<p>The intended final product is tangible and of high quality, as recognized by the standards of the discipline. Examples include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an article submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal • a juried or peer-reviewed performance or exhibition • a proposal submitted for external funding • research project development, data collection, or analysis • continuing education opportunities • a presentation of scholarship at a professional conference <p>Higher scores are given for wider or more significant recognition.</p>
Methods (10 points)	To achieve its goals, the project uses sound methods as recognized by the standards of the discipline.
Feasibility (10 points)	<p>The application is organized and presents a feasible route to the project's completion within one year of the award. If it is a multi-year project, it identifies tangible benchmarks for each year of the project.</p> <p>Its detailed budget presents an appropriate use of university funds. The applicant has used previous University Grants productively (if applicable).</p>

The Committee's Suggestions for Improving Process

The committee came up with several suggestions aimed at improving the process for distributing grants. These suggestions were discussed at the meeting, and then, via email, sent to the committee chair. Here are summaries of four suggestions:

1. That each college evaluate their proposals in a uniform manner before sending those proposals to the Grants Committee. It would be particularly helpful if each college showed us its scoring rubrics for each proposal. It would also be helpful if each college gave some brief comments to explain those scores.
2. That the definition of the "final product" be clarified on the scoring rubric.
3. That there be an established way for the committee to give feedback to faculty members whose proposals were rejected so that those faculty members would know how to improve their proposals and resubmit them.
4. That each proposal should show not just how much it is being funded by other sources (such as by the department or the college), but also that it should demonstrate if the applicant has tried to get money from those sources. Currently, there are places on the application that show if the proposed project is receiving funding from other sources, but if those places are left blank or if they filled in with \$0, then it is impossible to say whether that money has been requested and denied or if it has never been requested in the first place.