Scoring Guidelines for URC Faculty Research Proposals

Eligibility Questions (Applicants cannot be visiting faculty members)

Yes or No	1.	Is the funding request for a project intended primarily for normal academic responsibilities in curriculum development or teaching activities?
Yes or No	2.	Is the funding request for the purpose of completing academic research toward a degree?
Yes or No	3.	Is the funding request for research initiated by a student?
Yes or No	4.	Does the proposal fail to include all required sections (A through J)?

If the answer to any of these four questions is **Yes**, the proposal is **not** eligible for URC funding.

Priority Criteria

Criteria	2 pts.	1 pt.	Pts. Earned
Previous receipt of URC Research Grant Funding*	The applicant has never received URC funding.	The applicant has received URC funding, but it occurred more than two academic years ago.	
Tenure Status	The applicant is a tenure- track faculty member.	The applicant is a tenured faculty member.	
Other Funding Sources		The project has no other sources of funding to support the work.	

*URC Funding does not include awards for Summer Stipends.

Review Criteria

Criteria	5 – 6 pts.	3 – 4 pts.	0 – 2 pts.	Pts. Earned
Significance of the Project	Background literature is included that builds a convincing argument for the significance of the project.	Although background literature is included, it does not build a convincing argument regarding the significance of the project.	Little or no literature is cited in support of the project.	
Scholarly Contribution of the Project**	It is clear from the proposal that the project will make a strong contribution to the discipline and/or community.	The contribution of the project is made clear in the proposal, although it seems limited in scope/nature.	It is not clear from the proposal how the project will contribute to either the discipline or the community.	
Criteria	3 pts.	2 pts.	0 – 1 pt.	Pts. Earned
Readability	The proposal uses non- technical language, making it easily understood regardless of the reader's disciplinary background.	The readability of the proposal is disrupted on a few occasions due to the use of highly technical language.	The readability of the proposal is frequently disrupted due to the use of highly technical language.	
Proposal Format and Length	The proposal is double spaced with one-inch margins. The total document is 5 to 8 pages in length.		Either the proposal is not double spaced with one- inch margins OR its length does not fall within the range of 5 to 8 pages.	
Equipment	If funds are requested for purchasing equipment, the proposal builds a clear argument for the value of the equipment to UCA	The proposal includes a request for equipment but either only partially provides an argument regarding the value of the	The proposal includes a request for equipment but provides neither an argument regarding its value to UCA beyond the	

beyond the project. In addition, a plan is presented regarding where the equipment will be housed and how it will be maintained. Note that if no equipment is requested, then two points are awarded automatically for this criteria.	provide a plan for where and how the equipment will be maintained.	project NOR plan for where and how it will be maintained.	
--	--	---	--

**An argument for strong scholarly contribution might include: describing future plans for external funding; including students; connecting results with future research; and/or indicating the impact of results on the UCA/local community.

Budget Notes

In addition to the information in the URC Proposal Guidelines, the following notes are offered.

- 1. Publishing expenses are not considered an allowable expense.
- 2. The recommended upper cap on requested funds is \$10,000. In the event that the requested funds exceed this amount, the faculty member is strongly encouraged to seek additional funding sources to offset the expenses.
- 3. Undergraduate student workers should be paid \$10 per hour. Graduate student workers should be \$12 per hour.