Scoring Guidelines for URC Faculty Summer Stipends

Eligibility Questions

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**)?
              5. Is the funding request from a visiting faculty member?

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 Summer Stipend Funding	The applicant has never received URC Summer Stipend funding.	The applicant has received URC Summer Stipend funding, but it occurred more than two summers ago.	
Tenure Status	The applicant is a tenure-track faculty member.	The applicant is a tenured faculty member.	

Review Criteria

Criteria	5 – 6 pts.	3 – 4 pts.	0 – 2 pts.	Pts.
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.	
Other Sources of Compensation	No compensation is provided by other sources.	Although there is compensation provided by other sources, it is limited or minimal.	Significant compensation is provided by other sources or the proposal's details regarding compensation are limited.	
Criteria	**3 pts.**	**2 pts.**	**0 – 1 pt.**	**Pts.**
Readability	The Summary/Overview uses non-technical language, making the value of the project easily understood regardless of the reader's disciplinary background.		The description of the value of the project presented in the Summary/Overview is disrupted due to the use of highly technical language.	
Proposal Format and Length (check this)	The proposal is double spaced with one-inch margins. The entire document is 5 to 8 pages in length for Sections B through H.		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 for Sections B through H.	
Timeline	A timeline for completing the project is provided and is reasonable.	A timeline for completing the project is provided. The reasonableness of the timeline is questionable.	A timeline for completing the project is not provided.	

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.