



**FACULTY PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL
(FPDC)**

**ANNUAL GRANT PROGRAM
GENERAL INFORMATION AND GUIDELINES**

*REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
for submission during the
2020-2021 Academic Year*

FPDC RECEIPT DEADLINE: 5:00pm; Monday, February 15, 2021

MU CAMPUS DEADLINE: DECEMBER 18, 2020

CONTENTS

I. General Information and Guidelines

Purpose and Eligibility	2-3
Criteria and Definitions	3-4

II. Annual Grant Program Description

General Stipulations.....	5
Submission Requirements and Deadline.....	5
Evaluation Process	6
Request for Proposals	6-8
Category 1-A Joint Faculty-Student Basic or Applied Research	
Category 1-B Scholarly Research: Basic or Applied	
Category 2 Joint Faculty-Student Public Service	
Category 3 Creative and Performing Arts	
Category 4 Innovation in Teaching and Improvement in Student Learning Outcomes	
Category 5 Individual Career Enhancement in Off-Site Settings	

III. Proposal Instructions

Preparation of the Proposal	9-11
Budget Instructions.....	11-12

IV. POST AWARD INSTRUCTIONS..... 13

APPLICATION PACKAGE

Format for Title Page.....	14
Format for Budget Summary	15
Format for Letters of Collaboration	16
Checklist for Proposal Writers	17
Instructions to Campus Committees for Electronic Submission.....	18

I. GENERAL INFORMATION AND GUIDELINES FOR ALL FPDC GRANT PROGRAMS

These guidelines include directions and criteria that apply to all proposals submitted for the State System Faculty Professional Development Council (FPDC) Annual Grant Program. More specific information is appended to these guidelines. **Be sure to adhere to Part I: General Information and Guidelines; the specific criteria and stipulations provided in Part II: Annual Grant Program; and the proposal preparation and submission instructions in Part III: Proposal Instructions.**

PURPOSE

The State System of Higher Education Faculty Professional Development Council was established by Board of Governors' Policy 1985-06-A, "to encourage continuous attention to the professional growth and development of System faculty as teaching scholars." The Council has addressed a wide range of faculty interests, needs and talents, and provides professional development opportunities for faculty at all levels and in all disciplines and professional fields. The Annual Grant Program is intended to provide professional growth opportunities for individual faculty incorporated with the three strategic priorities of the Board of Governors in the System Redesign, which includes a strong focus on projects that encourage student success. A general definition of "faculty professional development," as the Council interprets it, is included in the Criteria and Definitions section on the following page.

SYSTEM REDESIGN

The Board of Governors has affirmed three strategic priorities as part of redesigning the System for Pennsylvania's future:

- Ensuring Student Success
- Leveraging University Strengths
- Transforming the Governance and Leadership Structure

Student Success is the #1 priority. Serving more than 100,000 students from every county in Pennsylvania, the State System is the largest provider of higher education in the Commonwealth. Talented faculty and staff at each of the 14 universities deliver affordable, high-value, high-quality educational experiences to their students. In fact, "Ensuring Student Success" is not just a statement but our mission. The Board has affirmed the following Student Success Mission:

Our 14 State System Universities provide access to high-value, relevant educational experiences that prepare our students in a timely manner for pathways to successful lives and careers.

The FPDC determined at its Spring 2018 meeting that it will support the Student Success priority in the award of the funds. Therefore, proposals must address Student Success by describing how the individual(s)' professional development will translate to an impact on students, i.e. impact on faculty teaching and student learning. Examples of such impact include but are not limited to professional development that enables faculty to implement High Impact Practices, which include joint faculty-student research (Category 1-A of this RFP), service learning (Category 2), experiential learning, and capstone courses/projects, among others. Category 4, innovation in instruction and student learning, encompasses many of the remaining High Impact Practices. See <https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips> for more examples and information.

Proposals are not limited to faculty professional development on High Impact Practices and applicants are to provide their own explanation and demonstration of how their professional development proposal will impact student development and learning and subsequent success. This is further addressed in the Contents of the Proposal in Section III.

ELIGIBILITY

A proposal will not be considered if it is illegible, if it fails to comply with these guidelines, or if the information provided is incomplete.

1. Project Directors must be System faculty members. They may be Regular Faculty, defined as a “tenured or tenure track faculty member,” including Probationary Non-Tenured Faculty, defined as a “faculty member who is appointed to a tenure track position and who has not been granted tenure” (APSCUF CBA).
2. Non-tenure-track faculty members (defined as a “faculty member who is appointed to service in a position in which service will not be credited toward tenure”, e.g., Temporary Part-Time or Temporary Full-Time or Regular Part-Time faculty) are encouraged to apply *with* a tenured or tenure-track faculty member if the latter is the primary grantee. Temporary faculty must indicate that they expect to be employed at the institution during the grant period.
3. Faculty may conduct grant-funded projects while on sabbatical but may not request salary for replacement faculty in these circumstances.
4. Project Directors of previous FPDC grant awards are eligible to apply, but their current proposals must include an appendix consisting of no more than one side of one page listing the year, title, and category of previous grants, briefly indicating project outcomes.
5. If the Project Director has not submitted a final project report for any current or previous FPDC awards, then s/he is NOT eligible to apply.
6. Please note the specific cost limits for release time and summer stipends on page 11, Budget Instructions.
7. A **maximum of sixteen (16) proposals** may be submitted from each university. A university committee makes recommendations to the university administration on the proposal(s) that will be forwarded to the FPDC. Signatures from both the university’s committee chairperson and the university provost (or designee) indicate endorsement of these recommendations. Electronic signatures are permitted.

CRITERIA AND DEFINITIONS

The following criteria will be applied in evaluating all grant proposals submitted to the FPDC:

1. Potential Professional Development Benefits to be realized by Faculty Member(s) Involved

Professional development involves the acquisition of knowledge and/or development of skills related to some aspect of the faculty member’s professional responsibilities that correlate in some way to student success. This may involve increasing knowledge in one’s discipline, a related discipline, or interrelationships among disciplines. Other areas of consideration are knowledge about how students learn, about issues facing colleagues in business or basic education or another professional field, or about national trends and issues in higher education that can be translated to student outcomes. A faculty member may develop artistic skills, hone research skills, improve skills in organizing and integrating knowledge, develop pedagogical skills, sharpen performance skills, gain experience in using administrative skills, or learn how to use technology to enhance teaching and learning. The professional development lies in the learning that occurs in carrying out the project and the relevance of that learning to the faculty member’s ongoing growth and development as a professional teacher-scholar positively impacting student experiences. **Proposers should fully explain specifically how award of the grant will enhance their personal professional development and its connection to university students, using a minimum of 50 words or one paragraph.**

2. Significance and Impact of the Proposed Project and its Projected Outcomes in Relation to the Purpose of the RFP and the specific Category

A priority will be given to projects that focus on student learning and development and ultimate student success. Proposers should answer the following: How do these funds impact student

outcomes that contribute to the mission of providing access to high-value, relevant educational experience that prepare students in a timely manner for pathways to successful lives and careers?

Significance and impact of the proposed project and its outcomes focuses on what others will learn or how they will benefit from the work. In addition to students, a secondary impact could include colleagues locally or nationally, other faculty at one's own university and/or other institutions, members of community groups, government agencies, health-care organizations, public school personnel, etc. In addressing other audiences, proposers should answer the following: How much will others learn? How many stand to benefit from the project in one way or another? How important is the contribution to knowledge—and/or to the well-being of some target group—that the project promises?

3. Clarity, Completeness, and Reasonableness of the Proposal and the Budget Request, Including Adherence to These Guidelines (specifically address the following points as completely as possible in non-technical language):

- what you or others have done previously that relates to your project
- what you expect to accomplish
- what work will be done during the course of the project
- who will perform the work (i.e., include names of students, consultants, presenters, etc., whenever possible, to show advance planning for the project)
- how the work will be performed
- where the work will be performed
- when the work will be performed (grants usually run for 14 to 16 months)

4. Feasibility of Realizing the Project's Objectives Given Applicable Expertise, Financial Resources, and Proposed Timeline

5. Appropriateness for System Faculty Professional Development Council Funding

Consider the nature of the project, items for which grant funding is requested, and the probable availability (or lack thereof) of other funding sources.

6. Adherence to Guidelines, including format, completeness and designation of correct category or your proposal may be returned without review.

II. ANNUAL GRANT PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

GENERAL STIPULATIONS

In addition to the eligibility requirements listed in the General Information and Guidelines (page 2-4), the following stipulations apply specifically to the FPDC Annual Grant Program.

1. A faculty member may not submit more than one proposal for which he/she is to serve as the Project Director in the annual grant program.
2. Proposals submitted in response to this RFP will be considered only for the FPDC 2020-2021 Annual Grant Program.
3. As there is some overlap among RFP categories, in some cases the applicant and/or the campus faculty committee must choose the category that represents the “best fit” for the proposal.
4. Projects may start immediately upon receipt of an award notice from the FPDC. Projects are to be completed by October 31, 2022. Reports are to be submitted to the FPDC within 30 days of the project’s completion, but no later than November 30, 2022. Any grant funds not used or encumbered by that date are to be returned to the FPDC.
5. The **maximum grant award limit** for individual annual grants awarded this year is **\$8,000**. Grant proposals requiring amounts above \$8,000 should be submitted to other funding sources or show on the budget how the additional amount is provided as a contribution from a university or other revenue source.
6. The Annual Grant Program is not intended to be a continuing support mechanism for ongoing projects.
7. Although future funding of the Annual Grant Program is not committed at this time, faculty members who receive awards in this round of grants are expected to serve as Peer Reviewers *if and when* the Annual Grants Program receives funding in future years.
8. Faculty members who receive awards must follow their institution’s COVID-19 policies/guidelines when implementing their project.

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND DEADLINE

The faculty campus committees will designate the deadline for submission of proposals for the campus screening process and will write this deadline in the space provided on the cover of these guidelines. The university should stipulate the number of copies to be submitted to the campus committee. *The campus committee may enter additional instructions to University faculty here:*

Up to sixteen (16) grant proposals, endorsed by the campus committee and university provost (or designee), **must be uploaded by the university’s designated committee member or Sponsored Programs Office (Grants Office) to one of the following links no later than 5:00 p.m., Monday, February 15, 2021:**

Category	InfoReady Links to Submit Proposals
1, 3, 4, or 5	CATEGORY 1, 3, 4, or 5 Proposals
2	CATEGORY 2 Proposals

Any required letters of endorsement (Category 5), letters of collaboration (all categories) or forms requiring signatures must be included in the proposal PDF file. Proposals that do NOT include required letters of endorsement (Category 5) or required signed forms will **NOT** be funded.

EVALUATION PROCESS FOR THE ANNUAL GRANT PROGRAM

The FPDC review process is collegial and relies on expert peer review and Council members for comments and rankings. The amount of feedback that can be provided on unsuccessful proposals is limited, but every attempt will be made to provide meaningful and helpful review comments. Faculty members are urged to work with their campus faculty committees, grants offices, and other colleagues, in developing and garnering critiques of proposals *prior* to submission to the FPDC.

The award of funds to selected recipients is expected to be announced by the end of April 2021.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE ANNUAL GRANT PROGRAM

The Council anticipates it may receive 130-150 grant proposals this year, based on the amount received in prior years. The total amount of money budgeted for the Annual Grants Program is approximately \$300,000. At a maximum award of \$8,000, funds may be sufficient for approximately 38 awards.

Funding reservations within this year's RFP:

1. \$300,000 for any faculty professional development activity authorized by the Council. The \$300,000 is currently designated for this RFP. It may be awarded for Categories 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and for any eligible faculty.

The funding reservations are mandated by the Collective Bargaining Agreement with the faculty union, APSCUF. Any balance of the \$300,000 can be directed to faculty professional development activity authorized by the Council in current or future years.

The Council will make an attempt to proportionally award funds by Category (see Category definitions below). The Council is not obligated to award all funds. Un-awarded funds will remain available to the Council for its programs.

Category 1-A: Joint Faculty-Student Research

Purpose – To promote faculty and student interest and involvement in research projects in all disciplines where that research will contribute to professional growth. Research means a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalized knowledge. Applied research is broadly defined as problem-oriented research that has application beyond the scholarly community. All projects are expected to result in scholarly publications, an appropriate joint presentation, reports to appropriate public agencies or other organizations, and/or grant proposals to external agencies.

The proposal must address how it contributes to student success, i.e. the applicant must describe and demonstrate how students will benefit from the faculty's professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning and subsequent success.

Special Stipulations – One or more undergraduate or graduate students enrolled at the institution at the time the research is conducted must participate in projects proposed in this category. The purpose is not, however, to fund essentially independent research by students. A student may not be the project director or principal investigator. The student(s) must work in partnership *with* the faculty member(s)—not merely *for* or *under* the faculty. Proposals must include an explanation of how students will be selected and how they will work with faculty both in the research and in the dissemination of its outcomes.

Category 1-B: Faculty Research

Purpose – To promote and support individual or joint faculty research projects in all disciplines where that research will contribute to professional growth. Research means a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalized knowledge. Applied research is broadly defined as problem-oriented research that has application beyond the scholarly

community. All projects are expected to result in an appropriate presentation, demonstration, publication, reports to appropriate public agencies or other organizations, and/or grant proposals to external agencies.

The proposal must address how it contributes to student success, i.e. the applicant must describe and demonstrate how students will benefit from the faculty's professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning and subsequent success.

Category 2: Joint Faculty-Student Public Service

Purpose – To promote and support faculty and student involvement in public service. Projects are expected to result in significant service to external organizations, non-profit agencies, or target groups within the community or region. In addition, there should be an expectation of student and faculty growth in understanding community needs and the ways that participants can help meet those needs.

The proposal must address how it contributes to student success, i.e. the applicant must describe and demonstrate how students will benefit from the project or the faculty's professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning and subsequent success.

Special Stipulations – Proposals involving development or implementation of courses incorporating “service-learning” may be submitted in this category.

Category 3: Creative and Performing Arts

Purpose – To support those activities and projects in the creative and the performing arts with demonstrated relevance for professional development. Projects are expected to result in juried presentations or exhibitions, public performances, publications, or some other recognized form appropriate to the particular field. The Council will not fund proposals that are aimed primarily at funding existing campus wide arts series, festivals or events that are historical to the university in any way.

The proposal must address how it contributes to student success, i.e. the applicant must describe and demonstrate how students will benefit from the faculty's professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning and subsequent success.

If the primary effort in an arts proposal is research, the proposal may be submitted under Category 1. If the primary effort in an arts proposal is curriculum, instruction and assessment, the proposal can be submitted under Category 4. If the primary effort in an arts proposal is training and learning, the proposal may be submitted under Category 5.

Category 4: Innovation in Teaching and Improvement in Student Learning Outcomes

Purpose - To explore innovative or alternative instructional methods (including effective use of technology); conduct classroom research; revise curricula; or develop assessment strategies intended to strengthen teaching and learning. The purpose is to provide professional development that is required to gain expertise in – to learn – innovative methods of teaching that improve student learning outcomes. The purpose promotes and supports opportunities for faculty to develop their skills in evidenced-based, highly effective methods of teaching and learning, and employing instructional materials and methods that have a convincing evidentiary basis of effectiveness, including but not limited to, more extensive use of modern laboratory methods, proven distance learning education methods (or hybrid) designs and improved approaches to motivating student interest and supporting students efforts to succeed, and develop assessment strategies intended to strengthen teaching and learning. In this Category, proposals involving professional development that will be applied to teaching large-enrollment, lower division classes and to developmental education, as well as STEM areas and teacher education are encouraged.

The proposal must address how it contributes to student success, i.e. the applicant must describe and demonstrate how students will benefit from the faculty's professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning and subsequent success.

Special Stipulations

1. Within this Category, the Council is focusing on **professional development related to implementing innovations in teaching and improvement of student learning outcomes.**
2. The proposal must identify how students will benefit from the work. Proposers should answer the following: How will this improve learning for others? How important is the contribution to student learning that the project promises?

Category 5: Individual Career Enhancement

Purpose – To support an individual faculty member’s career enhancement. Career enhancement refers to enhancing knowledge, understanding, or skills that facilitate advancement, success, renewal, and fulfillment in the profession as it equates to increased student learning. Grants will be awarded to projects that clearly demonstrate how the faculty member will become better able to meet the current and/or long-range needs of the university and its strategic focus surrounding student success; enable a faculty member to develop or update skills and/or knowledge by working in an off-site academic or non-academic setting which provides unique opportunities related to the applicant’s discipline or role as a faculty member. Such experience may contribute to knowledge and skills in the faculty member’s current teaching area, a new area of interest, or a related field that broadens the individual’s competence. Projects involving international travel to teach and/or conduct research or service activities for periods of a month or more (not for short conferences) are encouraged. Postdoctoral or other study for faculty members to expand their knowledge beyond their prior education or training to meet the changing needs in academic programing at their home university is supported. Proposals should indicate how the experience will contribute to the applicant’s teaching, scholarship, or service.

The proposal must address how it contributes to student success, i.e. the applicant must describe and demonstrate how students will benefit from the faculty’s professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning and subsequent success.

Special Stipulations

1. Requests may be made to cover costs of travel, lodging, and other direct costs incurred during the course of the proposed activity.
2. Requests may be made to help fund an alternative workload assignment during the academic year or a summer stipend of up to \$2,000 per month for a maximum of two months, provided no compensation is received from an outside organization with whom the applicant will be working.
3. A letter of endorsement from the appropriate Deans or Department Chairs concerning the relationship between the proposed project and the university or unit goals must be included. **Category 5 proposals submitted without the letter will not be considered.**

III. PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

PREPARATION OF THE PROPOSAL

The FPDC has strict limits on length of proposals. **Proposals that do not adhere to the Format Guidelines will not be reviewed.** Required formats for certain parts of the proposal are also important to ensure clarity, consistency, and comparability. Please carefully observe the following instructions regarding **FORMAT**.

A. **FORMAT GUIDELINES**

1. **The Grant proposal narrative including the budget summary and budget notes must not exceed SIX pages, single-spaced.** (Use the content guidelines provided on pages 9-11 to order the narrative.)
2. Do not attach other items or appendices (e.g., letters of support, extra budget pages) that are not listed below (a-g). The following items **should be included** in addition to the six-page narrative:
 - a. The title page;
 - b. Required two-page PI and co-PI curriculum vitae;
 - c. A short list of references (not to exceed one page);
 - d. A one-page summary of any previous FPDC grant(s) received by the Project Director;
 - e. Letters of endorsement for Category 5 only (described above).
 - f. A copy of the title page and signatures page of any contract directly related to your project (e.g., with a publisher).
 - g. Letters of collaboration for any category. Letters may only be included from collaborators mentioned in the proposal narrative who are not listed as Co-PIs on the cover page and are not students. The letter must follow the format on page 16.
3. Page set-up requirements: The font size used in the proposal must be no smaller than the font size on this page (11 pt). Margins may be no less than one inch. This applies to attachments as well.
4. All pages of the narrative (including budget) must be numbered, preferably at the bottom.
5. The FPDC membership represents a variety of disciplines; care should be taken to avoid disciplinary jargon as much as possible. Write in a non-technical style and language. When technical terms are unavoidable, a short (one sentence, parenthetical or footnote) explanation is encouraged.
6. Check and re-check the budget instructions to be sure that your proposed budget is in compliance and follows the format given on page 15 of these guidelines. Verify that the amount requested from the FPDC listed on the proposal title page is accurate and agrees with the amount listed as the total in the **first column** of the budget sheet.

B. **CONTENT GUIDELINES**

Some categories call for additional information (see page 6 to 8), but the following must be included in all grant proposals:

1. The title page in the required format (page 14). Be sure to include project title and RFP category. The title should clearly indicate academic purpose/intent to a lay reader. Co-Project Directors must be listed. (NOTE: all correspondence pertaining to the proposal will be sent only to the first person listed who will be held accountable for submitting the final project and financial reports if a grant is awarded.) The title page also includes a one-paragraph abstract (approximately 150 words) of the proposal written in non-technical language and provides spaces for required endorsement signatures.
2. Endorsement signatures of the university faculty committee chair (representing the full committee) and the university provost (or designee) on the title page are required. Proposals involving faculty from more than one university must carry the endorsement signatures of the Faculty committee chair and provost only of the Project Director's university. Electronic signatures are permitted.

3. Project narrative – The narrative should be concise but include sufficient information to permit effective review by a multi-disciplinary group. Language should be non-technical in nature. Be specific and informative; avoid redundancy. All narratives must include the following sections:
- a. **Background and Significance** (approximately 1 page) –
 - Briefly sketch the background of the present proposal.
 - Evaluate existing knowledge or practice (what others have found or done).
 - Specifically identify the gaps or needs which the project intends to fill.
 - If you have performed previous work related to the proposal, describe previous findings or outcomes.
 - Clearly state your view of the proposed project’s significance.
 - ***NEW: Articulate how students benefit from the faculty’s professional development; outlining the impact on student development and learning; any change in class instruction or change in classroom learning outcomes; or other student outcomes.***
 - b. **Goals and Objectives** (approximately 1/3 to 1/2 page) –
 - List your broad long-term goals (including professional development goals), and
 - Provide a point-by-point listing of the specific objectives to be addressed in the proposed project.
 - c. **Description of Project** (approximately 2 pages) –
 - Describe the design of your project and the procedures to be used or activities to be engaged in to accomplish your specific objectives.
 - If appropriate, include the means by which data will be collected, analyzed, and interpreted.
 - Provide a tentative sequence or timeline for the work.
 - Include at least one paragraph on dates/timelines of critical events and discrete phases of the project.
 - Your description may be divided into further sub-sections for clarity.
 - d. **Expected Outcomes** (approximately 1/2 page) –
 - ***List expected outcomes, including what you expect to learn and what others will learn, including the ultimate impact on student success.***
 - Explain how the grant will enhance your professional development in one paragraph.
 - Explain any plans for continuing the project beyond the grant period.
 - Describe means of application, and/or dissemination of findings or results.
 - e. **Project Evaluation** – (approximately 1 page)
 - Describe your method of measurement for all outcomes.
 - How you will evaluate your project success
 - f. **Project Budget** – (approximately 1 page)
 - The final page of the narrative must include the budget presented in the required table format (page 16)
 - Budget Notes that explain exactly how budget figures were calculated and how grant funds will be used.
 - Check addition to be sure totals are correct.
4. Assurance of compliance with university research requirements – It is the responsibility of the Project Director and the submitting university to assure compliance with all university research requirements (e.g., Human Subjects Research, Animal Welfare, Conflict of Interest, Integrity in Research) if applicable to the proposed project. Proposals must reflect the Project Director’s awareness that approval from

particular review bodies is needed (or not) and **must** indicate the timeline for securing such approval in the project narrative.

5. A summary 2-page curriculum vitae or resume for the Project Director and co-Project Director **must be appended to the proposal**. The vita should include only information relevant to the proposal and **must not exceed two pages**.
6. References– A full review of literature is not expected, but any sources cited or of particular relevance to the proposal must be listed in an appendix **limited to one page**. Short in-text references are also desired.
7. Previous FPDC grants and outcomes – Append a list of all previous grants consisting of no more than **one page** listing the year, title, category of previous grants, and briefly indicate project outcomes.
8. Proposals in Category 5 must append letters of endorsement from the appropriate Deans or Department Chairs. In these cases, the letter is expected to affirm congruence between the objectives of the faculty member(s) and those of the academic unit. **Category 5 proposals submitted without the letter will not be considered.**
9. Any other contract documents. (Described on page 12, item 15.)

BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS

The project budget must include all anticipated expenses and revenue. Wherever possible, projected expenses should be based on estimates provided by suppliers or appropriate university offices. Applicants are expected to exercise prudence and request funds only for essential costs that cannot be covered otherwise. The following instructions pertain to specific budget items. **All amounts should be rounded to the nearest dollar.**

1. Reassigned Time – If a project budget includes funds for replacement faculty to subsidize equivalency (reassigned time) for participating faculty, no more than the actual amount required for replacement at the instructor level (Q01 Step 1) will be paid. If an alternative workload assignment for a particular faculty member does not require replacement, funds for that purpose should not be requested.
2. Summer Stipends – The Council will award no more than \$2,000 per faculty member per month for up to two months during the summer. Summer stipends are intended to relieve faculty of the financial need to teach during the summer; the maximum stipend assumes full-time work on the project during the time period for which it is granted. Lower summer stipends should be requested if the faculty member(s) will not be devoting fulltime to the project during the funded period. In any case, justification in terms of time and effort, i.e. the amount of work, to be accomplished during the summer must be provided.
3. Other Stipends – Except in very unusual circumstances, the Council will not provide funds to pay stipends to System faculty for participation in professional development activities, such as workshops, retreats, etc. Nor will the FPDC approve use of grant funds to pay basic education teachers for participation in funded projects or to pay for substitutes for such teachers.
4. Student Wages – The exact nature of work to be performed by students should be indicated either in the proposal narrative or the Budget Notes. Requests for student hourly wages that exceed Pennsylvania’s minimum wage are allowed but **must** include justification in terms of university policy and/or the nature of the work to be performed by students. Clearly indicate how much students will be paid and for how many hours.
5. Fringe Benefits – Funds to cover fringe benefits for summer stipends, replacement faculty, graduate assistants, student wages, or any other compensation to individuals will **not** be included in grant awards. Because of the variability in amounts required for benefits and the fact that accurate estimates cannot always be made in advance, the universities are asked to cover benefit costs where needed. Estimated

costs for benefits, including benefits required for summer stipends, should be included in the University Contribution column of the budget summary.

6. Honoraria – The FPDC will award **no more than \$750 per day per person** for honoraria for external consultants or presenters. The university may contribute additional funding for honoraria if desired. Proposals should indicate the qualifications to be sought in a consultant or presenter or, preferably, include the names and credentials of the person(s) to be invited. Where appropriate expertise exists within the State System, the use of System colleagues is encouraged.
7. Supplies – These are consumable items required to carry out the project.
8. Equipment – Total requests for equipment, books, computer software, or similar items **not to exceed \$3,000** will be considered, provided that the proposal offers strong justification related to the needs of the project. Any such items purchased with FPDC grant funds will be the property of the university.
9. Operating Expenses – These include expenses for surveys (including paper and postage), off-site facility costs, housing and other items typically treated as direct costs, as well as refreshments or other costs associated with meetings that may be part of the project. Items that are typically treated as indirect costs cannot be charged to the grant.
10. Research Travel – Estimates of travel expenses included in project budgets should conform to University travel-expense regulations. Travel monies should be requested only for travel that is directly related to the proposed project and that would not ordinarily be covered from the departmental or university budget.
11. Presentation Travel – Travel to present a paper on the results of the funded project will be allowed, not to exceed \$1000 per project, for any/all project personnel, including students, to present results of the funded project (only) within the mandatory end date of the project with no extensions allowed solely for presentation travel.
12. Indirect Costs – The Council does not fund overhead or indirect costs such as accounting, university space, clerical support, or legal.
13. University Contribution – To gauge the feasibility of a proposed project—whether or not its goals can be accomplished—the Council requires information about additional funding, including any university contribution that has been committed to the project. University matching funds are not required and do not affect selection. In the Budget Summary, please list only specific dollar amounts, if any, pledged to the particular project by the university or from other sources. It is assumed that in-kind support (e.g., some clerical support, copying, etc.) will be provided in many cases; in-kind support may be mentioned in Budget Notes, but estimates of the monetary value of this support should not be included in the Budget Summary. **The signature of the provost or designee on the title page will be understood as confirmation of amounts listed in the University Contribution column.** Universities have different procedures for verifying funding commitments; the Faculty committee and/or grants officer should be able to provide information in this regard.
14. Other Revenue Sources – Estimated or actual funds pledged or anticipated from external sources should be listed in this column of the budget format; these sources should be identified in the Budget Notes.
15. Contracts – Proposals that involve a contract for a book or other materials to be prepared as part of the project must append a copy of the contract’s title page and signature page ONLY. Advance payments from the contractor should be included in the Project Budget under Other Revenue Sources; anticipated royalties need not be listed as part of the Budget Summary, but an estimate should be included in the Budget Notes.
16. The required format for the budget summary appears on page 15.

IV. POST AWARD INSTRUCTIONS

Upon award of the funds by the FPDC, the Office of the Chancellor will prepare and issue Letters of Understanding (LOUs) with the awardees' universities. The LOUs will incorporate by reference the terms and conditions of this Request for Proposal.

During project implementation, requests for budget revisions, extensions or other project changes will be managed according to the Council's policy on post-award proposal/project revisions, with the following exception for minor budget revisions:

- Universities may revise **the line items** in a budget up to a maximum of 10% of the original award amount without PASSHE approval. For example, a grant of \$5,000 may have cumulative line item revisions up to and including \$500.00 with only notification to their campus' grant and accounting offices. This does **not** mean a project director can over-expend the grant award by 10%.
- Budget revisions that exceed 10% must be submitted to PASSHE.
- Please note that ANY budget revision may not exceed the line item limitations listed in the budget instructions.

EXTENSIONS. In order to secure an extension, a Project Director must submit a request that outlines the reasons an extension is needed, i.e. the delay in the completion of the planned scope of the project. A Project Director can request as much time as needed to compensate for prior delays, but no more than one year. A Project Director can receive no additional money; but the balance of the awarded grant will remain available for budgeted expenses. A project cannot be extended simply because there is a balance of funds or to expand the scope of the original project. There must be a legitimate reason directly related to the planned scope of the original project. Extensions are not allowed solely to expend funds to travel to make presentations.

BUDGET REVISIONS. A request for a budget revision should include an explanation of the reasons for the shift in funds and a description of the impact on the project. Identify reasons the revision is necessary to accomplish the project objectives and reasons the funds are not needed in the original budget category.

Project Directors should work with their specific office on their campus that oversees grants (e.g. Grants Office, Sponsored Programs Office) prior to sending a budget revision or extension request. All requests for revisions or extensions can be submitted to FPDC@listserv.passhe.edu for the FPDC Executive Committee to review.

REPORT SUBMISSION. Final reports can be submitted to FPDC@listserv.passhe.edu.

REQUIRED FORMAT FOR TITLE PAGE OF PROPOSAL

University Proposal #

FOR PASSHE OFFICE USE ONLY: FPDC proposal #

Project Title:

RFP Category:

Total Grant Amount Requested from FPDC:

Discipline:

Sub-Discipline:

Project Director (name, position, department, university, telephone number, and e-mail address):

Faculty Status (see definitions below):

Tenured

Probationary

Non-Tenure Track

Other Participants and Collaborators (names, departments, e-mail addresses):

IRB/IACUC Status: Approved (Protocol #)

Pending

N/A

ABSTRACT (one paragraph of approximately 150 words in non-technical language):

Endorsement: _____
Chair, University Faculty Professional Development Committee Date

Endorsement: _____
University Provost or designee Date

Faculty Status Definitions:

Probationary Non-Tenured Faculty - a faculty member who is appointed to a tenure track position and who has not been granted tenure.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty - a faculty member who is appointed to service in a position in which service will not be credited toward tenure, for example Temporary Part-Time or Temporary Full-Time or Regular Part-Time faculty.

REQUIRED FORMAT FOR BUDGET SUMMARY

Round off all numbers to the nearest dollar, and list only whole dollar amounts. You may delete project budget line items from the table below if not being used.

Project Budget Line Items	Proposed Grant	University Contribution	Other Revenue Sources	Totals
Salaries/Stipends				
Student Wages				
Benefits	XXXXXX			
Honoraria (for consultant)				
Supplies				
Equipment				
Operating Expenses				
Travel				
Other (specify)				
TOTALS*	*			

* This figure is the total grant amount requested from the FPDC and must be listed on the title page of the proposal. Check addition carefully.

Budget Notes – Supporting detail for all budget items must be provided. Show how particular amounts were calculated.

REQUIRED FORMAT FOR LETTERS OF COLLABORATION

The language below is the only language that is allowed to be included in a letter of collaboration. Do not include any additional language.

If the proposal submitted by [insert the full name of the Principal Investigator] titled [insert the proposal title] is selected for funding by the FPDC, it is my intent to collaborate and/or commit resources as detailed in the Project Narrative section of the proposal.

Signature	Date
[name and title of collaborator]	

CHECK LIST FOR PROPOSAL WRITERS (AND CAMPUS SCREENING COMMITTEES)

This checklist is NOT to be submitted with the proposal.

Read and carefully follow the Council's General Information and Guidelines along with the individual Request for Proposals information.

- Does your proposal meet the eligibility requirements on page 2-3 of the guidelines? Yes___ No___
- Does your title page follow the required format and include: ___ tenure status, ___Abstract, ___IRB/IACUC and ___correct RFP category? Yes___ No___
- Does your proposal stay within the length prescribed by the FPDC Guidelines (Narrative including budget summary no more than 6 pages)? Are your pages numbered? Yes___ No___
- Is your Budget Summary and Format (page 15) in compliance with the Budget Instructions? Yes___ No___
- Does the figure listed on your title page for Total Grant Amount Requested from the FPDC correspond to the total of the first column in your Budget Summary? Yes___ No___
- Do the amounts entered on your budget table add up to the total you are requesting from the FPDC? Yes___ No___
- Do you fully explain and provide supporting details for each budget line in Budget Notes? Yes___ No___
- Does your budget comply with specific cost item limits for release time, fringe benefits, honoraria, equipment, travel, all outlined on pages 11-12? Yes___ No___
- Do you limit your appendices to those specifically allowed (listed as acceptable) and/or required in your category? Yes___ No___
- If you have previously received an FPDC grant(s), have you listed the year, project title, and outcomes in a one-page appendix? Yes___ No___ Have you submitted your final report? Yes___ No___ (This is an eligibility requirement.)
- Are the required curriculum vitae attached and within two page limit for each PI & co-PI? Yes___ No___
- Is the required one-page listing of references attached as an appendix? Yes___ No___
- If your proposal is submitted in Category 5, have you included the required institutional letter of endorsement? Yes___ No___
- Is your proposal written in non-technical language? Yes___ No___
- Are the goals or anticipated outcomes of your proposed project clearly stated? Yes___ No___
- Have you spelled out the project's anticipated professional development benefits? Yes___ No___
- Have you indicated briefly what you and/or others have accomplished previously in relation to the purpose of your project (if applicable)? Yes___ No___
- Does the proposal indicate what will be done, when it will be done (i.e. a timeline), and by whom? Yes___ No___
- Do you discuss the status or need for IRB or IACUC approval and the timeline for such approval? Yes___ No___
- NEW:** Have you clearly articulated how the proposal **contributes to student success** in "Background and Significance" section? Have you identified the ultimate **impact on student success** in the "Expected Outcomes" section of the narrative? Yes___ No___

**Please examine your proposal carefully before sending it. Revisions will NOT be allowed.
PROPOSALS THAT DO NOT MEET THE GUIDELINES OR DO NOT INCLUDE REQUIRED DOCUMENTS
WILL NOT BE REVIEWED.**

INSTRUCTIONS TO CAMPUS COMMITTEES FOR ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

[Subject to revision – ADDITIONAL NOTICES WILL BE SENT TO THE FPDC MEMBERS AND UNIVERISTY GRANT OFFICES]

Each proposal must be submitted using InfoReady only by a member of the campus faculty committee or a representative of the University Grants Office (Sponsored Programs Office). Any questions or inquiries should be sent to your University Grants Office or faculty committee chair.

One PDF file containing the entire required contents of the proposal must be submitted through InfoReady.

Guidelines for Naming Files for Electronic Submission. The file name should state the RFP Category, the researcher's name, the researcher's University, the University proposal #, and the file contents as follows—

- RFP Category: use the number from the categories in the RFP on pages 6-8, e.g. 1A
- Researcher's name: use the first four characters of the surname
- Researcher's University: use a three-character designation, e.g. MAN for Mansfield, ESU for East Stroudsburg
- Proposal # assigned by University – *should be a number 1 through 3*

Here are examples of the above:

1A-SMIT-LHU1

1B-JONE-ESU3

2-FREE-MAN2

RUBRIC FOR FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (FPDC) GRANTS Categories 1, 3, 4, 5
 (Council Member Review)
 REVIEW CRITERIA (rev. 06/06/18)

	Pre-screen	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
RATING	FPDC Category	PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES	PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE and/or CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD	STUDENT OUTCOMES	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	RESEARCH & ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY/ CREATIVE PROCESS	BUDGET
5 (Exemplary)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is in the correct category <p>Check if true ____</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the project objectives are very specific (well-defined), clearly measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe. All project outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature review is very clear and comprehensive, indicative of the current state of the art. Project contributions or significance are very clearly stated. Proposal substantiates the project contributions or significance is very important, valuable to the discipline and/or addresses a gap in research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student success and outcomes are very clear, well demonstrated (in "Background & Significance" section, and in "Expected Outcomes" section) 	<p>Project will significantly enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology/process is well stated, very appropriate and very comprehensive. It is very likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based upon the research & assessment methodology. The Project (i.e. the research idea or concept) itself is very rational/logical throughout. Named personnel have the expertise and exemplary abilities (i.e. background knowledge & skills) to complete the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is comprehensive and reasonable. All costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes. All costs are relevant and essential to this project.
4	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of the objectives are very specific, clearly measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe. Majority of the outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature review is clear and comprehensive, indicative of the current state of the art. Project contributions or significance are well stated. Proposal substantiates project contributions or significance is important, valuable to the discipline and/or addresses a gap in research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student success and outcomes are clear (in "Background & Significance" section, and in "Expected Outcomes" section) 	<p>Project will enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology/process is understandable, appropriate and comprehensive. It is likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based upon the research & assessment methodology. Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) is rational/logical. Named personnel have some expertise and required basic abilities (i.e. background knowledge & skills) to complete the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is comprehensive and reasonable. Majority of costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes. <p>Majority of costs are relevant and essential to this project.</p>

<p>3 (Good)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some objectives are specific, measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe. Some outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature review is somewhat clear, current and comprehensive, indicative of the current state of the art. Project contributions or significance are somewhat well stated. Proposal substantiates project contributions or significance is somewhat important, valuable to the discipline and/or addresses a gap in research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student success and outcomes are somewhat clear (in "Background & Significance" section, and in "Expected Outcomes" section) 	<p>Project may enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology/process is understandable, appropriate and adequate. It is somewhat likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based upon the proposed research & assessment methodology. Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) lacks rationality/logic in limited areas. Named personnel have the required basic abilities (i.e. background knowledge & skills) to complete the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is comprehensive and reasonable. Some costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes. Some costs are relevant and essential to this project-
<p>2</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some objectives are stated but are not specific or measurable or demonstrable, or attainable within the timeframe. Majority of outcomes do not relate to the project goals and objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature review is vague, contains some minor omissions; not indicative of the current state of the art. Project contributions or significance are vaguely stated. Proposal substantiates project contributions or significance may be somewhat important, somewhat valuable to the discipline and/or might address a gap in research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student success and outcomes are not clear (in "Background & Significance" section, and in "Expected Outcomes" section) 	<p>Project is not likely to enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology/process is incomplete and not understandable. It is barely likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based upon proposed research & assessment methodology. Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) lacks rationale/logic throughout. Named personnel have some relevant abilities, but lack important aspects (i.e. background knowledge & skills) to complete the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is not comprehensive and reasonable. Costs are partly justified in the budget narrative or notes. Some costs are partly relevant and essential to this project.
<p>1 (Poor)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is NOT in the correct category <p>Check if true _____</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No project objectives are stated. No project outcomes are stated. Objectives are very vague. Outcomes are very vague. Objectives are clearly not attainable in the project timeframe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature review is very vague and omits key information; not indicative of the current state of the art. Project contributions or significance are very vague or are omitted. Proposal does not substantiate project contributions or significance, value to the discipline and/or it addresses a gap in research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student success and outcomes are not evident (in "Background & Significance" section, and in "Expected Outcomes" section) 	<p>Contribution of project to author's professional development is very vague or omitted entirely.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology/process is very vague or omitted. It is not likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based upon omission of, or vaguely stated, research & assessment methodology. Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) is not at all rational/logical. Named personnel lack any relevant ability (i.e. background knowledge & skills) to complete the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is unreasonable in all areas. Costs are not justified in the budget narrative or notes. Many costs are not relevant and essential to this project.

LEXICON:

Objectives are statements of what the Project Director (PD) intends to accomplish and which are measurable.

Outcomes are the results or accomplishments of the project and are therefore directly reflective of the objectives.

PI is the Principal Investigator or Project Director. In evaluating expertise and skill, one includes co-Principal Investigators and co-Project Directors.

RUBRIC FOR FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (FPDC) Category 2 PUBLIC SERVICE GRANTS
(Council Member Review)
REVIEW CRITERIA (rev. 6-18)

	Pre-screen	Factor 1	Factor 2 for Public Service (Category 2 only)	Factor 3	Factor 4
RATING	FPDC Category	PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES	PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE and/or CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD	STUDENT OUTCOMES	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
5 (Exemplary)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is in the correct category Check if true ____	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the project objectives are very specific (well-defined), clearly measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe. All project outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community need is very clear, well demonstrated Project contributions or significance are very clearly stated A lit review confirms the services reflect current best practices in the field; are very appropriate to address the need. 	Student success and outcomes are very clear, well demonstrated. (in "Background & Significance" section, and in "Expected Outcomes" section)	Project will significantly enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large.
4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of objectives are very specific, clearly measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe. Majority of the outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community need is clear Project contributions or significance are well stated A lit review confirms the services reflect current best practices in the field; are appropriate to address the need 	Student success and outcomes are clear (in "Background & Significance" section, and in "Expected Outcomes" section)	Project will enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large.
3 (Good)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some objectives are specific, measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe. Some outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community need is somewhat clear Project contributions or significance are somewhat well stated A lit review confirms the services reflect current best practices in the field; are appropriate to address the need 	Student success and outcomes are somewhat clear (in "Background & Significance" section, and in "Expected Outcomes" section)	Project may enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large.
2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some objectives are stated but are not specific or measurable or demonstrable, or attainable within the timeframe. Majority of outcomes do not relate to the project goals and objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community need is not clear Project contributions or significance are not clear A lit review is vague and the services may not reflect current best practices in the field 	Student success and outcomes are not clear (in "Background & Significance" section, and in "Expected Outcomes" section)	Project is not likely to enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large.
1 (Poor)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is NOT in the correct category Check if true ____	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No project objectives are stated. No project outcomes are stated. Objectives are very vague. Outcomes are very vague. Objectives are clearly not attainable in the project timeframe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community need is not evident Project contributions or significance are not stated; not impactful A lit review is missing or insufficient to draw any conclusions if the services are appropriate or will impact on the need 	Student success and outcomes are not evident. (in "Background & Significance" section, and in "Expected Outcomes" section)	Contribution of project to author's professional development is very vague or omitted entirely.

	Factor 5 for Public Service (Category 2 only)	Factor 6
RATING	PROJECT METHODOLOGY and ASSESSMENT (Category 2 only)	BUDGET
5 (Exemplary)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology, procedures, activities assessment are well stated, appropriate and very comprehensive It is very likely the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs'. The project itself is very rational, logical throughout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is comprehensive and reasonable. All costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes. All costs are relevant and essential to this project.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology, procedures, activities assessment are understandable, appropriate and comprehensive It is likely the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs' The project itself is rational/ logical 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is comprehensive and reasonable. Majority of costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes. Majority of costs are relevant and essential to this project.
3 (Good)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology, procedures, activities, assessment are understandable, appropriate and adequate It is somewhat likely the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs' The project itself lacks rationality/logic in limited areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is comprehensive and reasonable. Some costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes. Some costs are relevant and essential to this project-
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology, procedures, activities, assessment are incomplete and not understandable or appropriate It is barely likely the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs' The project itself lacks rational/ logic throughout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is not comprehensive and reasonable. Costs are partly justified in the budget narrative or notes. Some costs are partly relevant and essential to this project.
1 (Poor)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology, procedures, activities, assessment are very vague or omitted. It is not likely that the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs'. Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) is not at all rational/logical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is unreasonable in all areas. Costs are not justified in the budget narrative or notes. Many costs are not relevant and essential to this project.

LEXICON:

Objectives are statements of what the Project Director (PD) intends to accomplish and which are measurable.

Outcomes are the results or accomplishments of the project and are therefore directly reflective of the objectives.

PI is the Principal Investigator or Project Director. In evaluating expertise and skill, one includes co-Principal Investigators and co-Project Directors.

Faculty Professional Development Council (FPDC) Grants Council Member Review Form (rev 6.12.18)

PASSHE PROPOSAL #: _____
INVESTIGATOR(S) NAME(S): _____
NAME OF UNIVERSITY: _____
REVIEWER'S NAME: _____

DATE: _____

Please refer to the rubric & guide for interpretation of the review criteria. A Proposal **MUST** score a minimum of 3 on every criterion.

Is the proposal in the Correct CATEGORY? A subcommittee majority makes this determination **Yes** ____ **No** ____

Review Criteria	Please Mark (X) <u>only one number</u> or score for each criterion					Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	Poor		Exemplary					
PROJECT OBJECTIVES & OUTCOMES (Factor 1)	1	2	3	4	5		X3	
	Poor		Exemplary					
PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE &/or CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD (Factor 2)	1	2	3	4	5		X1	
	Poor		Exemplary					
STUDENT SUCCESS (Factor 3)	1	2	3	4	5		X3	
	Poor		Exemplary					
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Factor 4)	1	2	3	4	5		X5	
	Poor		Exemplary					
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY/CREATIVE PROCESS (Factor 5)	1	2	3	4	5		X3	
	Poor		Exemplary					
BUDGET (Factor 6)	1	2	3	4	5		X1	
Probationary Faculty ____ Yes ____ No ____								
TOTAL SCORE (possible Maximum Weighted Score is 80)								

IRB/IACUC Requirements (Please Check): Approved Pending Missing Not Applicable
 Comments: _____

GUIDE TO THE FPDC REVIEW FORM & RUBRIC

Components of the Review Form

The FPDC Review Form is comprised of the following pieces of information: a) PASSHE-assigned Proposal Number; b) Investigator(s) Name(s); c) Investigator(s) Institution(s); d) Reviewer's Initials; e) Date of Review of Proposal; f) Six Review Criteria or Factors; g) Five-point Evaluation Scale with Operational Definitions of each Review Criteria; h) Institutional Review Board (IRB) Need, and i) Open-ended Review Comments.

Pre-screen. Is the Proposal in the correct category? The majority of members of the FPDC sub-committee must agree that the proposal is in the correct category. However, some distinctions between categories are subjective (e.g. joint faculty-student projects) and a close reading and a careful discussion of the proposal is necessary to make an informed judgment. If the majority of the Council Subcommittee believes the proposal is NOT in the correct category, it should be disqualified without finalizing a score. NO POINTS or weight are awarded for this criterion.

Review Criteria. All complete FPDC grant applications will be evaluated using the following six criteria:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Objectives & Outcomes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Development |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Significance &/or Contribution to the Field | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Research Methodology |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student Outcomes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget |

Operational Definitions of each Review Criterion or Factor are explained on the RUBRIC FOR FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (FPDC) GRANTS with a Five-point Evaluation Scale. Each of the six review criteria in the complete FPDC grant proposal is evaluated based on a five-point scale; with 1 indicating Poor and 5 indicating Exemplary.

Interpreting the Rubric.

Before using the FPDC Rubric to score each applicant's proposal, the reviewer should become very familiar with its contents. In employing the FPDC Rubric to evaluate each proposal, it's strongly recommended to start from the **bottom of the instrument** (equivalent to a rating of one) **and proceed** upwards (until a maximum possible rating of five). Faculty applicant must demonstrate that the statements identified within each level of each Review Criterion are all applicable or not applicable before proceeding upwards to the next scale or level. For example, if an applicant has met all the indicators or statements identified at level 1 for "Project Objectives & Outcomes", then the Reviewer should proceed to the level 2 to determine if he/she has met all indicators, and so on. If an applicant has met all indicators in levels 1, 2, 3, 4, but not 5, then he/she should receive a maximum score of 4 for that particular Review Criterion. Prospective and successful investigators, in achieving a maximum score of 5, must fulfill ALL of the performance indicators or operational definitions contained within each of the Review Criteria or Factors. A Proposal must receive a minimum score of 3 on every Criterion in order to be considered eligible for funding.

Multiply the score of 1 to 5 by the weight to arrive at the weighted score for each factor. Total Score is the sum of the weighted score column. Add 5 points if the Project Director is probationary faculty (see proposal title page). The total possible or maximum score that an applicant can receive, after weighting, is 80.