



SECTION IV

Description

The Research Component encourages high-quality teaching by providing opportunities for continuing faculty and academic staff to renew their intellectual vitality and further their professional growth through research/professional development activity that is **appropriate to the proposer's discipline**. Therefore, activities might include (all of these activities will be referred to as research because they are investigatory in nature):

- search for new knowledge,
- artistic endeavors (creative writing, graphic arts, dance, musical composition, etc.), and
- application of existing knowledge to well-defined practical goals.

The Research Component provides opportunities for faculty and staff to grow as scholars and, in turn, benefit the University's students by improving the quality of their academic experience and by providing opportunities for faculty/student collaborative research. In addition, the Research Component will help the University respond to the growing needs of the community and region for research consultation and problem solving.

Most research programs are expected to lead to **tangible outcomes** such as:

- books,
- publications in refereed print journals or electronic media,
- performances,
- professional exhibitions, or
- published software.

The range of Research Component proposals is expected to reflect the diverse backgrounds of the University community. Proposals that may be submitted include, but are not limited to, those that:

- continue an ongoing program of professional growth,
- indicate a significant change in the direction of professional growth, or
- seek to re-cultivate professional interests following an extended period of University-related service.

There is no limit to the number of times an individual can apply and receive support through the Research Component. However, the Research Component is not a substitute funding source for available extramural funds (see Section II, General Information, Matching Funds and Extramural Grant Writing section). One Research Component goal is to provide faculty and academic staff with opportunities to gain experience and knowledge that will enable them to submit competitive proposals to extramural funding agencies. Therefore, in situations where external funding sources exist, the Research Committee may require evidence of having submitted an extramural proposal as a contingency for obtaining future support.

Procedures

1. Faculty Development Board issues a request for proposals approximately two months prior to the submission deadline. Typically, there are two cycles (Fall and Spring).
2. Proposers are encouraged to discuss plans with department/unit chairs, Research Component grant recipients, Faculty Development Board Research Committee, or colleagues.
3. Faculty and academic staff then submit proposals to department/unit Chair(s) and/or Dean(s) for signatures (represents a commitment of resources and facilities). Workload and scheduling must also be approved.
4. Dean's office forwards proposals to Faculty Development Board.

Here is the proposal review process:

1. The Faculty Development Board Chair and the Director of Grants and Faculty Development make panelist assignments to four members of the Research Panel.
2. Research Committee examines assignments to ensure fairness.
3. Panelists perform independent double-blind evaluation.
4. Evaluations are consolidated and proposals are rank ordered to facilitate discussion.
5. Research Committee reviews each proposal.
6. Numeric rating scores and reviewer comments are presented and discussed by the Research Committee.
7. Research Committee closely studies the panelists' reviews to ensure fair evaluation (committee may reject the evaluation of one or more panelists) and develops recommendations for proposals.
8. Faculty Development Board reviews recommendations and considers policy issues when making proposal recommendations to the Provost and Vice Chancellor.
9. Provost and Vice Chancellor reviews proposals and recommendations and makes a decision about each proposal.
10. Proposer receives Provost and Vice Chancellor's decision, which may include special conditions of an award.
11. Proposer and panelists receive summaries of panelists' scores and comments.

Eligibility

All continuing UW Oshkosh faculty and teaching academic staff holding full- or part-time academic year appointments are eligible. Faculty or academic staff on annual appointments are not eligible for CAS (Compensation for Additional Service) support. Recipients of Faculty Development Program support must forgo or return the previously approved support if they will not be continuing for one regular semester following the completion of the supported project.

Proposers whose final reports have not yet been evaluated by the Faculty Development Board or whose projects have been deferred are eligible for future CAS and/or auxiliary funding. Proposers whose projects are **past due** are not eligible for consideration. Refer to General Information (Section II) for details. Call ext. 3215 with questions regarding a project's status.

Awards for **projects involving human subjects** are contingent upon approval from the UW Oshkosh Institutional Review Board. For **projects using animals**, an award is contingent upon approval from the UW Oshkosh Animal Use and Care Committee. Contact the College of Letters and Science to obtain information and application forms.

Prereading Service

Information sessions and a prereading service are available. To request a prereading, submit one copy of the proposal draft (typed, single-spaced) to the Faculty Development Office at least three weeks prior

to the submission deadline. An experienced reviewer will critique the draft. While this does not guarantee subsequent approval, reviewer comments may help improve the final version.

Proposals

1. Submit **six stapled copies of the proposal, including two copies with a cover sheet**, to your department/unit chair and dean. The cover sheet is available in Appendix C, from the Faculty Development Office, or on-line at <http://www.uwosh.edu/grants>.
2. Double-blind review: Because the review process is double blind (neither the proposer nor panelist knows the others identity), proposals and other materials must be written in a manner that maintains anonymity. Proposers must ensure that neither their name nor any other identifying information appears in the proposal and or other materials. The review process will end if a proposal or other materials reveals the proposer's identity in any way. In such cases, the proposal will be returned to the proposer at the end of the cycle without a recommendation for funding. When necessary (for example when citing one's self, in support letters, etc.) the word "author" should be inserted in place of the proposer's name.
3. Proposals must be 8-10 pages in length and include:
 - a. an abstract (1 page),
 - b. a proposal narrative (5-8 pages),
 - c. a detailed budget (include CAS/reassigned time request and auxiliary support; such as supplies/materials, student assistance, etc.) and justification for each item (1-2 pages), and
 - d. a letter of support from unit head (only if a commitment of resources is needed).

Abstract – A one-page summary of proposal.

Proposal Narrative – Five to eight sequentially numbered pages describing your project (single-spaced, no smaller than 12-point type). The proposal should be **understandable to those outside of the discipline**. A proposal may require additional sections, but proposals are evaluated on each of the following content items, including writing quality (see Research Proposal Evaluation Form later in this section).

a) **Contribution to the Field**. The proposer must explain the project's relationship to previous efforts on this topic, and the contribution the project will make to the field. Proposals may include:

- applicability of results to University or professional community,
- publishability of results,
- likelihood of valued outcome or product, and
- potential for subsequent extramural grant.

b) **Scholarly Nature of the Project**. State the specific objectives of the proposed project, including what the project intends to accomplish, in terms of hypotheses and/or questions. The objectives should flow logically from the need/problem identified in the review of literature or related activities. Considerations may include:

- relationship to relevant prior work and/or soundness of theoretical or creative concepts as appropriate to discipline,
- relevance to previous research in discipline or creative endeavors, and
- adequacy of literature review.

c) **Creativity or Originality of the Project.** Explain how the project outcomes will build on previous work and contribute to the field in new and creative ways. Considerations may include:

- probable contribution to new knowledge or creative work,
- degree of innovation, and
- uniqueness of project in relation to similar research or professional development activity.

d) **Methodology, Approaches, or Protocol.** Explain how the project objectives will be met (i.e., how the hypotheses/questions will be tested/answered, or how the identified research problem will be explored). Provide a description of and justification for the procedures, methods, and/or plan that is to be followed in order to meet the objectives.

e) **Timeline/Achievability.** Provide a detailed timeline for project activities. A proposal involving more than one individual should clearly describe the activities of each individual. Explain the proposer's previous experience/training in the research methodologies and discipline. Show that time, equipment, materials and intra/extramural support are available. Explain what alternatives are available if problems occur. Explain time and money already invested. If people are to be interviewed or observed, provide evidence that permission has been obtained (i.e., attach support letters or e-mails). If other special preliminary considerations exist, show that arrangements have been made. Article, manuscript, creative, or translation writing are supportable when tied directly to the creative or analytical processes. The writing must be justified methodologically, tied to professional development, and justified as part of the creative process.

f) **Project Outcomes.** In addition to a final report, the proposer must identify **tangible** outcomes that show the project has been completed (e.g., publication manuscripts, conference papers, artistic or creative works, models, a proposal for extramural funding, final reports for other agencies, demonstrations, exhibitions and manuals). If an evaluation date other than February following receipt of the award is required, identify and justify an alternative project evaluation date.

g) **Professional Development.** Discuss how the proposed activities will lead to significant professional development. Complete a self-assessment of each proposer's strengths and weaknesses. Explain how this project is related to other professional development efforts (completed or planned). This information must be presented in an anonymous manner for each proposer in a multi-person proposal.

h) **Clear and Concise Writing.** The majority of the **panelists will be from outside the proposer's subject field.** Therefore, avoid technical jargon and define terms/concepts. Proofread for organization, grammar, readability, clarity of objectives, sufficiency of details, length of proposal and legibility. Panelists are instructed to "grade low" rather than to "give the benefit-of-the-doubt" when they cannot understand crucial ideas.

Budget Requests and Justification

a) **CAS/Reassigned Time/Auxiliary Funds.** Faculty and teaching academic staff may request CAS, reassigned time (a maximum reduction in teaching load of three credits per semester), and/or auxiliary funds in support of a project. The proposal must state and justify the level of CAS and/or reassigned time for each individual. CAS requests should be clearly tied to activities described in the project timeline.

The Research Component provides CAS support on the basis of a full-time one-month appointment receiving 7.5 percent of the academic year salary. Salary support at a level of up to 15 percent per faculty and academic staff member may be awarded if **a clear and convincing case is made to justify the level of CAS support.** The maximum amount of CAS that can be requested at any time across all components cannot exceed 15% of the proposer's salary.

The nature of certain projects may justify the extension of CAS and auxiliary support for more than one year. In the approval of multi-year projects, a funding commitment of CAS and auxiliary support is made for the initial year. Funding beyond the initial year is contingent upon the submission of an annual progress report to the Faculty Development Office and the approval of that report by the Research Committee. **In cases where extended CAS support is requested, proposal writers must include a justification for this request in terms of project requirements within the proposal narrative and must also include a timeline for completing specific project activities and submitting an annual progress report.**

CAS and/or reassigned-time requests for **more than one faculty or academic staff member must clearly explain why more than one investigator is essential to the project and must delineate each participant's role and effort.**

Proposal writing, literature searches, and report writing are not eligible for CAS support.

If CAS or auxiliary support is approved at an amount less than requested because the level of support was not adequately justified, the proposer may accept or decline the award or complete the project at the approved amount. The award recipient cannot negotiate for lesser project outcomes because the Board has approved a lesser amount.

Reassigned time is limited to a one-course (3-credit) reduction per semester and will be granted only with the approval of the department/unit chair and dean (or their respective equivalents). Note: The Faculty Development Board equates a request for 3 credits of reassigned time to a 7.5 percent CAS request.

Research Component proposals may be written to fund the writing of an extensive extramural grant. Refer to General Information, Matching Funds and Extramural Grant Writing, for details. Proposals may also be written requesting supplemental funds for extramurally funded projects. The same criteria as for other research proposals will be used.

If auxiliary funds are requested, the proposal narrative must contain an "Auxiliary Funds Justification" section. The Faculty Development Board will not provide funding for items more than \$500, including equipment, books, computer software (for special software purchases, see Special Auxiliary Budget Software Initiative, Appendix G), or other items for which the use-life extends beyond the project period. Requests will be considered for items less than \$500 and supplies or services that are consumed in the activities of the project. Computer literature searches indexing, page charges and maintenance of university owned equipment will not normally be supported as an auxiliary expense.

- b) **Travel.** Support for out-of-state or out-of-country travel must be justified. If projects require travel in consecutive years, justify the objectives and outcomes for each year.
- c) **Student Support.** The purpose of student support is to directly support the professional development of the proposer. If requested, justify the number of student hours (hourly wages that exceed the minimum wage must also be justified) and explain how the work supports the professional development of the applicant. Student support from this program should not be used to replace support from the **Student/Faculty Undergraduate/Graduate Collaborative Research Program** that is administered through the Office of Grants and Faculty Development. Student job descriptions and hourly wages are subject to approval by Human Resources.

Final Report

A project is assigned an evaluation date when approved for funding. A final project report is due on or before this evaluation date and should include:

- a summary of project objectives and activities,
- evidence of tangible products produced,
- an abstract of not more than 250 words on the final report abstract form provided by the Faculty Development Office (also available on-line),
- a self-analysis of the professional development experienced by each grant recipient,

- details of how the proposed project objectives were achieved, or
- an explanation of why proposed outcomes were not achieved (the project may be deferred or declared past due).

See General Information (Section II) for more information about types of support, report due dates, project evaluation procedures, project report deferral and past-due projects or contact the Faculty Development Office (ext. 3215).

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN OSHKOSH - FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
Research Proposal Evaluation Form

Proposal Number: _____ Name of Reviewer: _____

Rate Criteria 1-8 using the following scale. Do not leave a blank.	
1-2 Poor. Minimal potential.	7-8 Very good. Fundable in present form.
3-4 Fair. Has deficiencies that should be addressed.	9-10 Nearly perfect. <i>(Use sparingly.)</i>
5-6 Good. Workable idea. Has minor deficiencies.	

NOTE: Your input is critical to a valid and constructive evaluation process. Please remember that the proposal, not the proposer, is being evaluated. While the proposer is not expected to address **all** considerations listed under the criteria below, the proposer is responsible for providing an adequate explanation for each criterion. Panelists should provide constructive suggestions to improve the proposal. Recognize that professional activities, methodologies, and research/professional development/scholarly objectives will differ significantly across academic disciplines. When reviews are completed, they are compiled and reviewed by a Research Committee member who acts as the proposal's proponent. The Board's position is that a proposal shall be funded whenever feasible.

HAS THE PROPOSER:	RATING
1. ... explained how project will CONTRIBUTE substantially to the field? Is project significance and importance justified? Has relationship of the project to previous efforts on this topic and the contribution it will make to the field been presented? Considerations may include: applicability of results to University or professional community; publishability of results; likelihood of valued outcome or product; potential for subsequent extramural grant.	
2. ... justified that project is SCHOLARLY? Are project objectives presented in terms of hypotheses and/or questions to be addressed? Do objectives flow logically from the review of literature or related activities? Considerations may include: relationship to relevant prior work and/or soundness of theoretical/creative concepts as appropriate to discipline; relevance to previous research in discipline or creative endeavors; adequacy of literature review.	
3. ... defended project's CREATIVITY or ORIGINALITY? Do project outcomes build on previous work and contribute to field in new/creative ways? Considerations may include: probable contribution to new knowledge or creative work; degree of innovation; uniqueness of project in relation to similar research or professional development activity.	
4. ... justified METHODS, APPROACHES, OR PROTOCOL? Has proposer explained how the project objectives will be met, i.e., how the hypotheses/questions will be tested/answered, or how the identified research problem will be explored? Has a description of the procedures, methods, and/or plan and a justification for that design or plan been provided? Does it appear the plan will allow the proposer to achieve the project objectives? Remember that the description of methods will be discipline-specific, which means this section of a humanities proposal, for example, will be quite different from the same section of a social or hard sciences proposal.	
5. ... provided a timeline and sufficient evidence that the project objectives are ACHIEVABLE? Has a detailed timeline been included? Have activities of multiple proposers been described, if relevant? Is projected timeline consistent with scope of project? Has the proposer's previous experience and/or training in research methodologies and the discipline been explained? Is time, equipment, materials and auxiliary intra/extramural support available? Are problems anticipated and reasonable alternatives presented? Have time and money already been invested? If people are to be interviewed/observed, has their permission/acceptance or agency/institution permission/acceptance (as relevant) been obtained? Have other special arrangements been made?	
6. ... included clearly stated PROJECT OUTCOMES? Are adequate criteria proposed to judge successful completion of the project? In addition to the required final report, have other tangible outcomes been identified? Considerations may include: manuscripts for publications, papers for presentation, artistic or creative works, models, proposals for extramural funding, final reports for other agencies, demonstrations, exhibitions and manuals. Has the proposer explained how new knowledge, skills or abilities will be demonstrated?	
7. ... explained the PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT to be experienced? Has the proposer explained how the project will result in his or her professional development? Is a self-assessment of personal strengths and weaknesses relative to the project objectives included? Has the proposer explained the relationship of the proposed project to past/future work and the potential impact of the project outcomes on his or her future professional activities?	
8. ... presented a CLEAR and CONCISELY WRITTEN proposal? Are the principal ideas understandable to those outside of the discipline? Has technical jargon been avoided? Have terms/concepts been defined where appropriate? Other considerations may include organization, grammar, readability, clarity of objectives, sufficiency of details, length of proposal, proofreading and legibility. Panelists are expected to "grade low" rather than "give the-benefit-of-the-doubt" in proposals where principal ideas are not understandable.	
Total	

9. **Budget and Justification**

- | | | | |
|---|-----|----|----------------|
| • Is the total CAS/reassigned time support (for each proposer) appropriate and justified? | Yes | No | Not Applicable |
| • Is requested supplies/expenses/auxiliary budget appropriate and justified? | Yes | No | Not Applicable |
| • Is requested travel budget appropriate and justified? | Yes | No | Not Applicable |
| • Is requested student assistance support appropriate and justified? | Yes | No | Not Applicable |

10. Provide rationale for your response to question 9. (Rationale is required.)

11. Is there technical violation (i.e., double blind violation) that makes this proposal unfundable? Yes No

12. Please describe what makes this proposal unfundable. This is essential for the Research Committee's deliberation. (Rationale is required.)

PANELIST'S COMMENTS (REQUIRED):

A good review is useful to the proposer and helps the Committee to make decisions when disparate reviews are received. Panelists are responsible for the professionalism of their feedback to the proposers. Please be considerate with your written comments, yet maintain the high standards for quality associated with the Faculty Development Program. Negative feedback is to be accompanied by constructive suggestions. Please enter specific comments related to your ratings identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed research. Remember that you are evaluating the proposal and not the proposer. (Continue on a separate page, if necessary.)