CTRE Grant Application Review Rubric
Faculty Development Seed Grant

Project Title: _____ **Funds Requested:** _____

Project ID: _____ **Funds Approved:** _____

NOTE: Incomplete applications will not be reviewed.

	15 Points	12 Points	10 Points	8 Points	0 Points
I. Feasibility	The project's goals and timeline are feasible, manageable, and appropriate for the proposed project, demonstrating a clear and realistic understanding of the logistics and scope of proposed activities. Achievable project goals and milestones are outlined. If necessary, IRB approval has been secured. PI's ability to successfully execute project is strongly evident.	The project's goals and timeline are feasible, manageable, and/or appropriate for the proposed project, demonstrating an understanding of the logistics and scope of proposed activities. Achievable project goals and milestones are outlined. If necessary, IRB approval has been secured or is in the process of being secured. PI's ability to successfully execute project is evident.	The project's goals and/or timeline are feasible, manageable, and/or appropriate for the proposed project, demonstrating an understanding of the logistics and/or scope of the proposed activities. If necessary, IRB approval has not been secured but is in the process of being secured. PI's ability to successfully execute project is somewhat evident.	The project's goals and timeline have serious flaws in logistics and/or planning. IRB approval is needed but has not been sought. PI's ability to successfully execute project vaguely evident.	Not evident
II. Objectives	The project's hypothesis, goals, objectives, and outcomes are very clear, comprehensive, logical, and measurable.	The project's hypothesis, goals, objectives, and outcomes are clear, comprehensive, logical, and measurable.	The project's hypothesis, goals, objectives, and outcomes are clear and measurable.	The project's hypothesis, goals, objectives, and outcomes are clear or measureable.	Not evident
III. Methodology	Proposal articulates a research methodology that is clear, comprehensive, logical, and appropriate. No more or less is covered than what is needed.	Proposal articulates a research methodology that is two or more of the following: clear, comprehensive, logical, and appropriate. Some information is left out, or too much is included.	Proposal articulates a research methodology that is one or more of the following: clear, comprehensive, logical, and appropriate. However, much information is left out, or far too much is included.	Proposal articulates a research methodology that has a significant lack of clarity, logic, and/or appropriateness. A great deal of information is left out, or far too much is included.	Not evident

CTRE Grant Application Review Rubric
Faculty Development Seed Grant

	10 Points	8 Points	6 Points	4 Points	0 Points
IV. Significance of proposal	Demonstrates a high likelihood of making significant, positive, lasting contributions to its own and related disciplines	Demonstrates a high likelihood of making significant, positive, and/or lasting contributions to its own and related disciplines	Demonstrates a likelihood of making significant, positive, and/or lasting contributions to its discipline	Demonstrates little likelihood of making significant, positive, and/or lasting contributions to its discipline	Not evident
V. Potential for future development	Has a high probability of yielding new discoveries, opportunities for publication, and sustained development, with a strong likelihood of attracting outside funding. Specific funding sources are cited and detailed, realistic plans are included for how outside funding will be sought and possibly secured. Has great potential to lead to collaborative project(s).	Has a moderate probability of yielding new discoveries, opportunities for publication, and/or sustained development, with a likelihood of attracting outside funding. Specific funding sources are cited and realistic plans are included for how outside funding will be sought and possibly secured. Has potential to lead to collaborative project(s).	Has some probability of yielding new discoveries, opportunities for publication, and/or sustained development, with some likelihood of attracting outside funding. Specific funding sources are cited and plans are included for how outside funding will be sought and possibly secured. Has possibility of leading to collaborative project(s).	Has little probability of yielding new discoveries and/or sustained development, with marginal likelihood of attracting outside funding. Specific funding sources may or may not be cited. Has little to no possibility of leading to collaborative project(s).	Not evident
	5 Points	**4 Points**	**3 Points**	**2 Points**	**0 Points**
VI. Budget	The budget is clear, appropriate, and reasonable, and the budget justification sufficiently explains each budget item and why each is necessary for implementing the project. Together, the budget and budget justification have a strong correlation with the project's goals, objectives, and activities. Proposal provides full details and rationale regarding expenses, financial need, and other financial support available (such as institutional support).	The budget is clear, appropriate, and reasonable, and the budget justification sufficiently explains each budget item. Together, the budget and budget justification are correlated with the project's goals. Proposal provides details regarding expenses, financial need, and other financial support available (such as institutional support).	The budget is clear, appropriate, and/or reasonable, and the budget justification sufficiently explains each budget item. Together, the budget and budget justification are correlated with the project's goals. Proposal does not provide complete details regarding expenses, financial need, and other financial support (such as institutional support).	The budget is clear, appropriate, and/or reasonable. Additional information or materials are missing.	Not evident

VII. Literature Review	Literature cited is very pertinent and timely	Literature cited is mostly pertinent and timely	Literature review lacks pertinence or is dated	Literature review lacks pertinence and is dated	Not evident
VIII. Organization	Application and supporting documents and materials are organized, well written, and clear.	Application and supporting documents and materials are organized, well written, and/or clear.	Application and/or supporting documents and materials are organized and/or clear.	Application and/or supporting documents and materials are organized.	Not evident
IX. Applicant Status	First-time applicant	Received award more than two years ago	Received award more than one cycle ago but less than two years ago	Received an award in the previous cycle	N/A

Total points: _____ / 85 Possible

Revised 5.23.14