**KU New Faculty Research Development Award Reviewer Rubric + Feedback Form**

**Option 1**

**Applicant:**

**Project Title:**

**Reviewer Name:**

**SECTION 1: Review Criteria**

Evaluate each criterion on the scale defined in the rubric and explain your choice. *Reviewer comments will be shared with the review panel and the applicant.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Strong (1)** | **Satisfactory (2)** | **Developing (3)** |
| **Intellectual Merit.** The research idea and associated research plan are new and advance scholarship within the field of study.  | The research idea and research plan are significantly novel and have a high likelihood of advancing scholarship within the field of study. | The research idea and research plan are somewhat new and have the potential to advance scholarship within the field of study. | The research idea and research plan are not yet sufficiently novel and are unlikely to advance scholarship within the field of study.  |

**Assessment:** \_\_\_Strong (1)      \_\_\_Satisfactory (2)      \_\_\_Developing (3)   (type an X on the line before your score)

**Explain:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Strong (1)** | **Satisfactory (2)** | **Developing (3)** |
| **Feasibility and Outcome of Research Plan.** The proposed research plan can be performed within the budget and timeline and is likely to result in a scholarship product (i.e. publication or proposal). | There is high confidence the research plan can be performed within the budget and timeline, and there is little to no doubt it will result in a scholarship product.  | It will be challenging for the research plan to perform within the budget and timeline. More clarity should be provided to support the likelihood of the research resulting in a scholarship product.  | It is unlikely the research plan can perform within the budget and timeline. Consequently, it is also unlikely to result in a scholarship product. |

**Assessment:** \_\_\_Strong (1)      \_\_\_Satisfactory (2)      \_\_\_Developing (3)   (type an X on the line before your score)

**Explain:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Strong (1)** | **Satisfactory (2)** | **Developing (3)** |
| **Organization and Overall Impression** The proposal and project are well-organized. | The proposal and project are clear and organized in a manner that is logical and easy to understand. | The proposal and project are mostly clear and organized in a manner that is largely understandable. However, there are details that could be made clearer. | The proposal and project are unclear and not organized in a manner that is easily understandable. The proposal and project need more clarity and need to follow a more logical structure. |

**Assessment:** \_\_\_Strong (1)      \_\_\_Satisfactory (2)      \_\_\_Developing (3)   (type an X on the line before your score)

**Explain:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Strong (1)** | **Satisfactory (2)** | **Developing (3)** |
| **Budget**There is sufficient budget for proposed activities. The grant will provide needed funds to enable this scholarship.  | The proposal budget is clearly sufficient and outlines a well-justified need. | The proposal budget is likely sufficient and outlines a need that appears mostly reasonable. | It is not clear the proposal budget is sufficient for the proposal activities. The budgetary need is undefined and/or insufficiently justified. |

**Assessment:** \_\_\_Strong (1)      \_\_\_Satisfactory (2)      \_\_\_Developing (3)   (type an X on the line before your score)

**Explain:**

**SECTION 2: Summary Recommendation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation for funding:** Based on the above elements together, the project is likely to achieve its stated goals for a scholarship product (i.e. publication or proposal). | **Fund this proposal (1):** Most elements received a “Strong” rating; any elements with a “Satisfactory” rating can be easily improved. ***Add feedback below.*** | **Consider this proposal (2):** Some elements were rated “Strong” but others were rated “Satisfactory,” indicating some areas that need further development. With feedback, the proposer could improve the project plan. ***Add feedback below.*** | **Do not fund this proposal in its current form (3):** The proposal does not align with the NFRD program’s goals, or several of the elements above were rated as “Developing.” With feedback, the proposer could revise the project plan for consideration in future grant cycles. ***Add feedback below.*** |

**Recommendation:**       \_\_\_Fund this proposal (1)      \_\_\_Consider this proposal (2)      \_\_\_Do not fund this proposal in its current form (3)

**Explain:**

**SECTION 3:** List the strengths and weaknesses of this proposal, including recommendations for improvements to the project plan that applicants could incorporate for consideration in future grant cycles. Please support your comments with citations from the proposal narrative and/or CVs presented by the applicant.

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses/Recommended Improvements:**

**Total Score (5-15):**

*5 = most competitive for external funding
15 = least competitive for external funding*