UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENT
Summer Grant Proposal Development (SGPD)

The total amount of funding for this competition has not yet been determined.

The calendar below lists the governing dates for applications and recommendations:

09/27/21  Deadline to submit completed SGPD application in InfoReady

10/28/21  Final date for the College/School Deans and the College/School Research Committees to submit their reviews

12/08/21  Final date for the University Research Committee to send SGPD recommendations to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

12/22/21  Final date for the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs to notify SGPD applicants of funding decisions

Each College/School has a duly constituted Research Committee and has a representative to the University Research Committee. Applicants are encouraged to seek guidance from their College/School’s Research Committee.

Applications are required to be submitted via InfoReady (https://montclair.infoready4.com/). The submission deadline is **4:30pm EST on September 27, 2021**. Late applications will not be considered.

Applications will then be routed to Departmental Chairs before being forwarded to the Deans and College/School Research Committees for review.
Faculty as individuals or teams who are endorsed by their deans may apply for a stipend to prepare a grant proposal(s) to foundations or government agencies for programs, research, training, or creative activity.

The following guidelines have been developed for use by the faculty of the University. They are meant to serve as a framework both for individuals who apply for financial support and for those who evaluate the proposals submitted.

**ELIGIBILITY**
Any full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the faculty is eligible to apply for a Summer Grant Proposal Development stipend to prepare a grant proposal to a funder which may lead to external funding. Priority will be given to non-tenured faculty or tenured faculty that are expanding into new areas of research, creative activities or scholarship.

For a grant proposal that may lead to funding of:
- $40,000/year or more, faculty can request a maximum stipend of $4,000/person or $6,000/team (two or more faculty)
- between $39,999-$25,000/year, faculty can request a maximum stipend of $3,000/person or $5,000/team (two or more faculty)
- between $24,999-$10,000/year, faculty can request a maximum stipend of $2,000/person or $4,000/team (two or more faculty)

No more than one Summer Grant Proposal Development proposal per faculty member or team will be considered for each year.

The Summer Grant Proposal Development funding will begin on January 1, 2022 following the award announcement and continue to June 15, 2022.

In order to avoid the potential of a conflict of interest, faculty members who serve on the Colleges/Schools’ Research Committees or the University Research Committee may not submit an application to the Summer Grant Proposal Development, Separately Budgeted Research, Student Faculty Scholarship or University Distinguished Scholar programs. In addition, if any committee member believes that he/she has a conflict of interest due to an application submitted by a research collaborator, family member or another conflicting relationship, the committee member is advised to contact OSP as soon as he/she learns of the potential conflict. OSP will seek guidance and resolution from the University Research Committee Chair (if elected at the time of disclosure), the Union Observer and the Administration Observer.

**APPLICATION**
The University Research Committee (URC) has developed a standard application template. Applicants should use the *FY22 SGPD Application Instructions* document (available in InfoReady) for guidance in preparing an application. Applications must be submitted in InfoReady by **4:30pm EST on September 27, 2021**. Late applications will not be considered. Applications are then routed to Departmental Chairs for acknowledgement in the InfoReady system no later than **October 1, 2021**. Deans and the College/School Research Committees will forward their ratings to the Office of Sponsored Programs by **October 28, 2021**. The URC will review the applications submitted and will forward its recommendations to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
EVALUATION
The College/School Research Committee and Dean are the first to enter review for all applications. The evaluation within each college/school is consistent with the aims and goals of the SGPD program, and guided by the following:

1. Merit of the project considers the following:
   - Relative importance of scholarship to the individual faculty member, to the college/university, and to the field
   - Whether the proposed project is connected to some larger area of scholarship and builds on previous work in the field
   - How innovative is the proposed project
   - Potential impact of the proposed project to the field

2. Feasibility of the project considers the following:
   - Evidence as to whether the proposed project can be completed given the current environment, resources and the proposed time period
   - Whether the stipend request is appropriate
   - Evidence that the potential funding request to an external funder is realistic
   - Degree of knowledge about an external funder(s), including their mission, funding priorities, past awards, etc.

3. Quality of the proposal considers the following:
   - Application completeness and adherence to the published guidelines
   - How well the basic purpose and significance of the project are clearly stated so that they are understood by individuals not in the related field
   - Applicant’s effectiveness in marketing themselves
   - Writing quality

4. Priorities:
   - Non-tenured faculty
   - Tenured faculty that are expanding into new areas of research, creative activities or scholarship
   - Applicants that have not been previously funded by SGPD or applications that do not resemble in any way previously funded SGPD applications

The College/School Research Committee and Dean will assign a rating for funding for each application.

3. Strong - strong recommendation for funding
2. Good - moderate recommendation for funding
1. Adequate - low recommendation for funding
0. Not recommended, and not forwarded to OSP.
   Application(s) with a ‘0’ rating either by the Dean, College/School or both will not be forwarded to the University Research Committee.
After the College/School level evaluations, the University Research Committee will also rate the applications using the same criteria. In order to standardize their scoring, they will use the rubric below, which contains all of the same language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>The proposal lacks importance or connection to a larger area of scholarship. It may lack innovation or the potential for impact to the field.</td>
<td>The proposal is important and it is connected to a larger area of scholarship. It is innovative and it has the potential for impact to the field.</td>
<td>The proposal clearly demonstrates how the proposed work extends upon previous work in the field. It is innovative with obvious potential impact on the field.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>The proposal may not seem capable of being completed given the current environment, resources, and the proposed time period. The stipend request may be inappropriate. The potential funding request to an external funder may be unrealistic. The faculty member may not show knowledge about the potential funder including their mission, funding priorities, past awards, etc.</td>
<td>The proposal can be completed given the current environment, resources, and the proposed time period. The stipend request is appropriate. The potential funding request to an external funder is realistic. The faculty member shows knowledge about the potential funder including their mission, funding priorities, past awards, etc.</td>
<td>The proposal can be completed given the current environment, resources, and the proposed time period. The stipend request is appropriate. The potential funding request to an external funder is realistic. The faculty member shows knowledge about the potential funder including their mission, funding priorities, past awards, etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>The proposal is lacking in completeness or it does not adhere to the published guidelines. Its basic purpose and significance may not be clearly stated or it may be hard to understand by individuals not in the related field. The applicant may not have effectively or appropriately marketed him/herself. There may be errors in the writing.</td>
<td>The proposal is complete and it adheres to the published guidelines. Its basic purpose and significance are clearly stated so that they are understood by individuals not in the related field. The applicant has marketed him/herself appropriately. The writing is acceptable.</td>
<td>The description of objectives is thorough and conveys the importance of the work. The significance of these objectives is clearly stated so that they can easily be understood by individuals not in the related field. The candidate presents a strong case for their ability to complete this work based on experience. The proposal is well written and accessible to readers from multiple disciplines.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>The author is neither a non-tenured faculty member nor a faculty member that is expanding into new areas of research, creative activities or scholarship. The project may have been previously funded in this internal award category and/or it resembles a previously funded projects in this category in some way.</td>
<td>The author is a non-tenured faculty member or a tenured faculty member that is expanding into new areas of research, creative activities or scholarship. The project has not been previously funded in this internal award category and it does not resemble a previously funded projects in this category in some way.</td>
<td>The author is a non-tenured faculty member or a tenured faculty member that is expanding into new areas of research, creative activities or scholarship. The project has not been previously funded in this internal award category and it does not resemble a previously funded projects in this category in some way.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACCOUNTABILITY
In order to ensure continued support from Montclair State University, the procedures to be followed by the recipients of an award are:

A final grant proposal to an external funding agency must be submitted no later than June 15, 2022. Awardees that do not submit a proposal to an appropriate granting agency by June 15, 2022 will be ineligible to apply for future funding.

PURPOSE
The primary purpose of the award is to permit a faculty member(s) to focus on preparing/writing a major proposal for external funding. It is not intended for initial support of pilot research which may lead to an external proposal(s); Separately Budget Research is the more appropriate program for this purpose.

STIPEND
Stipends are paid in two installments, the initial payment (60%) in January 2022 and the final payment after submission of the proposal to an external agency. In addition, Summer Grant Proposal Development awardees cannot receive their final payment if the total amount requested in their grant proposal to an external funder does not match the eligibility requirements above.

For example, a Summer Grant Proposal Development awardee that was awarded a total stipend of $4,000 must submit an external proposal for at least $40,000/yr or more to receive their final payment.

For proposals submitted by a team, indicate on the attached funding cover sheet how the stipend is to be divided between or among team members.

HUMAN SUBJECTS
Where human subjects are to be used, assurance must be given concerning their physical and psychological safety. If you are using human participants, you must submit an Application for Review of Research Involving Human Participants to the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Guidelines for the use of human participants are available at https://www.montclair.edu/institutional-review-board/.

REVISIONS
Significant revisions of a project subsequent to the award and during the course of the project must be reviewed by the URC.