UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS | OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND SPONSORED PROGRAMS

AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN GRANTS IMPACT, SEEKING, AND STEWARDSHIP (AEGISS)

Description of Award
The annual Award for Excellence in Grants Impact, Seeking, and Stewardship (AEGISS) was established in November of 2018 (originally as the External Funding Award) to 1) recognize individuals for professionalism in obtaining and managing grants, 2) to promote a culture of grant writing among faculty and staff, and 3) to encourage grant recipients to track the impact of their grant work on the university community (faculty, staff, and students), the public (from the local to the global), and their disciplines/fields. Awardees will receive a plaque and $500. All applicants will receive a certificate of recognition.

Eligibility
The nominee must be a faculty or staff member who has submitted a full proposal—with UCA as the primary managing institution—through the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs within the last five years in an amount of at least $5,000. Awardees receive a plaque and a $500 stipend to be used as a bonus, for travel, or materials and supplies as arranged with your department chair. All applicants receive a certificate of recognition.

The following grants **cannot** be considered for this award because they are 1) under the funding threshold, 2) exclude either faculty or staff from consideration, 3) are not competitive, and/or 4) do not rise to the level of effort required in most funding guidelines:

- Contracts and cooperative agreements initiated by external agencies,
- CETAL Faculty Development Grants,
- Contracts and cooperative agreements initiated by external agencies,
- Diversity, Belonging, Inclusion, and Equity Grants,
- Faculty Empowerment Grants,
- Foundation Faculty Grants,
- Foundation Staff Grants,
- Subawards, and
- University Research Council Grants.

Faculty and staff members who receive this award will become eligible again after 7 years. Individuals who apply but do not receive the award may be nominated and re-apply in consecutive years.

Number of Awards
ORSP offers one award annually in this category.

Nomination Process
The nominating period will be announced with a link to the nomination form by November 1 of each year through the Academic Council, the Faculty and Staff Listserv. *The ORSP Grants Gazette*, Staff Senate, and *UCA Inform*. The nomination period will close on December 1. The AEGISS selection committee chair will verify eligibility of nominees and email eligible applicants within five business days, providing further instructions for applying for the award. The nomination form is available at https://forms.gle/kbi8sRUZchjFCgR87.

Potential applicants may nominate themselves.

Application Process
The AEGISS selection committee chair will invite eligible faculty and staff who have been nominated to submit an application by February 1. Applications will be shared with the committee by February 15 via Google Drive. Award finalists and recipients will be announced at the UCA Service Awards.

Because the ORSP recognizes that seemingly small grants can have broad impact and significance, nominees are asked to evaluate their external funding activity in their applications rather than focusing on the amount awarded. Packets should contain the following five items. Further instructions will be given upon nomination and determination of eligibility.

1. *Application Form.*
2. *Current CV* with eligible grants highlighted in yellow.
3. *Impact Statement.* From the list of grants awarded on the CV, the nominee should choose 1–5 funded grants to feature in a statement of no more than 1,000 words describing the impact of the nominee's external funding upon the university community, the public, and the discipline or field. Graphs, charts, and tables can help the reviewers see a clear picture of the impact and are encouraged. Questions nominees should answer in their statements are as follows:
    - What made the project(s) innovative?
    - What was the significant of the project(s)?
    - Who benefited from or will benefit from the project(s) and how? This could include students who helped carry out the project, audiences who attended a performance, teachers who obtained professional development, people or industries, knowledge gained by a successfully proven or failed hypothesis.
    - What partnerships or collaborations were created as part of carrying out project activities?
    - Did the grant(s) leverage other resources? What were these and how were they leveraged?
    - Did the project(s) attract other avenues of funding, such as other grants, donations, or in-kind contributions?
    - Will the project(s) lead to future endeavors?
    - If known, what was the funding rate of the program(s) from which you were awarded? For example, MAP Fund has approximately a 4.2% approval rate.
4. *Letters of recommendation.* Two letters should address the significance and impact of the project activity on individuals, for the university, in the community, and in the field. Letters from those directly engaged with the funded projects will carry more weight than letters from chairs and deans.
5. *Evidence of impact.* Include up to 10 items providing evidence of impact. These can include the following:
    1. Magazine / newspaper articles, screenshots of social media posts,
    2. Photos,
    3. Publications arising from the project,
    4. Other documentation if appropriate and available.

Scoring Process

The selection committee will score each application according to Criteria 1–4 and the Offices of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) and Post-Award Grants and Contracts (PAGC) will score applications on Criterion 5 using the rubric below, with all scores being aggregated into a single score. If two or more applications tie or score very closely, the selection committee may arrange a 15-minute interview with applicants to make a final determination.

Deadlines

November 1:	Call for nominations announced: Faculty Senate president, FS Listserv, *ORSP Grants Gazette*, Staff Senate president, and *UCA Inform*
December 1:	Nominating period closed; nominees invited to submit application
February 1:	Applications due; grant amounts redacted from CVs
February 15:	Selection committee scores applications on Criteria 1–4; ORSP & PAGC scores on Criterion 5
March 10:	Request for meetings with applicants who tied or whose scores were very close
March 15:	Awardee determined
April 15:	UCA Service Awards

Selection Committee

The committee will consist of three members who will serve on a three-year rotating basis and a permanent chair. As members roll off their service period, the committee chair will contact the Academic Council for faculty recommendations, the Staff Senate for staff recommendations, and ask the selection committee for qualified potential replacements from divisions outside their own.

Member	Representative Capacity	Term Expires
Jennifer Deering, Chair	ORSP & PAGC Staff	Permanent
Sherelle Lee	Any Academic Unit	Spring 2027
Mike Gallagher	Any Academic Unit	Spring 2026
Lesley Graybeal, Secretary	Any Staff Unit	Spring 2025

Each year the committee will elect a secretary to take meeting minutes.

Meetings

September:	The committee will meet once to go over deadlines.
February:	The committee may meet with applicants whose scores were tied or very close.
April:	The committee will meet twice, once to attend the UCA Service Awards and once to discuss improvements to the award process.

AEGISS Rubric

Instructions: Upon reviewing each application, please enter a score from 20 (being exemplary) to 0 (being insufficient evidence (see below) and provide brief comments to aid applicants in presenting a stronger case for award should their application be turned down.

Reviewer # (as assigned by the committee chair):
Applicant's Name:

Criterion	Score (0–20)	Comments
1. Impact in Innovation (20 Points) The application presents projects that address an exigency with a novel approach using unique methods for filling gaps in social knowledge or issues that affect the public. Innovation can be new approaches, concepts, processes, products, and/or works.		
2. Impact in Significance (20 Points) The grants highlighted define the exigencies addressed, why the projects were needed, and what was improved and/or continues to be improved because of the project, including elevating the campus, community, and discipline.		
3. Impact across Communities (20 Points) The highlighted grants demonstrate the broad impact of projects on diverse populations: underrepresented/underserved; students, faculty, and staff; the community/society at large. Consideration should be given to those that engaged the work of community members, students, and other faculty and staff in directly carrying out the grant activities.		
4. Grant Service and Future Grant Prospects (20 Points) The grants demonstrate an established history of grant seeking, whether over a period of years or several grants won in a short time. This history should indicate a future of successful grant seeking and/or developing the next generation of grant seekers through various collaborations.		
5. Professionalism in Grant Seeking & Stewardship (20 Points) The applicant has demonstrated clear, consistent, respectful communication with professionals in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and Post-Award Grants and Contracts. The applicant has demonstrated an understanding of the need for both compliance and amenability in the grant seeking and management processes, shared responsibility of duties and tasks, and a combination of proactive planning and flexibility to unique circumstances that can arise at any point—from project development through closeout.		
Total		

Score Range

18–20	For the criterion being scored, the application is an exemplary demonstration of the criterion presenting a guide that represents what all grant seekers should aspire to.
15–17	For the criterion being scored, the application mostly meets the standards outlined in the criterion.
14–15	For the criterion being score, the application somewhat meets the standards outlined in the criterion.
12–13	For the criterion being scored, the application demonstrates the bare minimum standards.
>11	The evidence is insufficient to score.