Checklist for RSPG applications

1. Did the applicant use the most recent from (December 2012)? Other versions will not be accepted.

2. Does the math add up on p. 1? Does the match add up on p. 3? Do the numbers in p.1 & 3 match?

3. Did the applicant obtain approval from the IRB or the Animal Use Committee, if necessary?

4. Have they provided some detail (as space permits) on the budget form (p. 3)?

5. Does the project summary concisely describe the undertaking?

6. In section I-A, “Background and Objectives,” does the applicant present their project in a way that is accessible to a general audience? Do they clearly articulate both the issues at stake and the stages of the project for which they are requesting funds?

7. Are they applying for the right type of grant? Applicants should only be applying for Hemingway Excellence or Collaborative grants in the first call for proposals in the Spring and Adjunct Faculty should only apply in the second call for proposals in the Spring.

8. Make sure there is adequate detail in the “Procedures and Methods” section (Section II). Applicants who are giving conference papers often fail to provide details in this section. This section must be filled out.

9. The time-line for the project (Section III) also must be filled out. Make sure applicants are detailed as possible about the timing of their project. If they are going to a conference, they should provide the conference dates.

10. Stress to applicants that it is crucial they fill out the “Evaluation and Dissemination” section (Section IV). This section gives us a sense of what kind of return the University can expect on its investment. Specificity helps – to what journal or publisher might they submit their finished project? What courses will they improve with their new knowledge?

11. Often applicants skip the budget narrative (Section V). We should be able to understand what every charge is on the budget sheet. If an expense is not self-evident, then a budget narrative is needed. Have the applicant explain how they arrived at the prices they did. Which airlines or travel agencies did they consult? What per diem rate are they using? How many miles did they calculate? Did they calculate benefits for assistants?

12. Every question in Section VI must be answered. If a question is not applicable, a “N/A” will suffice.
13. Make sure the body of the proposal (Section I-A through VI) does not exceed three single-spaced pages. Discourage the applicant from using a font that is too small (stick to 10 or 12 p.).

14. **Supporting documentation:**
   - If applicants are asking for funds to go to a conference, they must provide proof that their paper or poster has been accepted. We will not consider applications that lack this proof. If they wish to attend a workshop, they should provide information about it.
   - If applicants are asking for release time or stipend, they must have a memo from their department chair explaining why the project goes beyond the regular expectations of teaching and scholarship.
   - Applicants may, in this section, include other information about travel costs, etc. This is also an appropriate place to submit a bibliography.
   - If applicants have received prior funding from RSPG, a copy of their final report should be included with their documentation.

15. Only when you are satisfied that the form is accurate, complete, and comprehensible, should you sign it. Make sure the applicant brings you a revised version to sign—remember, a typed signature is not sufficient.

16. Please request to applicants that when making electronic copies of their proposal that they should send no more than 2 Appendices as files and that their files be labeled with their last name and Application; example, “Garza Application.pdf”; Garza Appendix A.pdf”
Guidelines for Scoring (0=excellent, 2=poor):
The following criteria will be used to evaluate proposals:

- Quality of the proposal (i.e., significance, relevance of methodology, importance of findings, value to larger academic community, community engagement, etc.). Proposals should be framed in a manner easily understood by someone outside the discipline. Proposals must meet high professional standards in presentation, including spelling, grammar, and detailed and accurate budget. Applicant should discuss the potential for peer-review publication, presentation, exhibition, etc.
- The committee receives a large number of travel grants, but grants involving students and using original research are generally given higher scores than travel to present at a conference. The committee views original research very broadly and as defined by the discipline.
- Travel grants for presentations shall be viewed more positively than simply attending a conference (unless attending is to receive specific training for project or to facilitate a leadership, discussant, or moderator role). Travel where more than one activity is occurring will be viewed more favorably as well. The committee views professional grants with high academic rigor, standards, and peer review more favorably.
  - Does the proposal communicate the importance of the work?
  - Is the importance of the project within its field made clear?
  - Will successful completion of the project have an impact upon the field? Is the importance for the individual, the department, &/or WSU described?
  - Is the project significant to the development of a program of scholarly activity by the lead investigator?
  - Are the objectives clearly defined, and is the basic question to be answered clearly identified?
- Proposals that have budgets that are appropriate and have additional monetary support from the department and/or colleges are viewed more favorably by the committee.
  - Have all items requested been justified?
  - Is the amount requested reasonable and consistent with the total funding available to this grant program?
  - If equipment is requested, has the possibility that it is already available elsewhere on campus been addressed?
  - If support for students is requested, is it clear that their activities are essential to the research program?
- Is the project feasible?
- Are project activities well planned, and do they realistically fall within an appropriate timetable?
  - Potential for disseminating research to broader academic community.
  - Value for professional development of faculty member.