

UW Oshkosh

Office of Sponsored Programs and Faculty Development

Faculty Development Program

Appendix E: Research Component Evaluation Form

Proposal Number: _____ Name of reviewer: _____

Rate each item under each category on the following scale. Do not leave blank.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Not addressed	Poor	Below average	Average	Above average	Excellent

Category 1: Scholarly/Artistic Merit of the Project **50%**

Has the proposer presented a persuasive case that the project has a scholarly/artistic merit?

a. The proposal justifies the purpose or need of the project, as well as its importance, including contribution to new knowledge or creative/artistic work.	
b. The proposal provides a brief review of literature appropriate to the discipline, or describes existing creative/artistic work, that supports the relevance of the project	
c. The proposal states clear project objectives, presented in terms of research questions, hypotheses, or artistic creations, that flow logically from the review of prior work	
d. The proposal describes clearly methods, approaches, or protocol for executing the project that are appropriate to the discipline.	
e. The proposal clearly indicates how the project aligns with and supports the UW Oshkosh strategic plan.	
Subtotal	

Category 2: Potential for Professional Development **25%**

Has the proposer clearly indicated the value for his or her own research potential and future progress and development?

a. The proposal clearly indicates that the project is a logical component of the proposer's long-term professional development plan.	
b. The proposal clearly indicates how the author's past research activity, and other qualifications, enhance the likelihood the project will be successful.	
c. The proposal clearly indicates the specific ways in which the project will contribute to the proposer's professional development, including how the project might affect his or her activity in the classroom.	
Subtotal	

Category 3: Project Timeline and Feasibility **10%**

Has the proposer provided a timeline and sufficient evidence that the research project is feasible and achievable?

a. The proposal clearly describes the activities that the proposer will undertake during the funding period, and, if relevant, the distinct roles of multiple proposers.	
b. The proposal has a detailed timeline that describes the expected amount of time for each activity and clearly indicates that the total required time is consistent with the requested financial support.	
c. The proposal clearly indicates that any necessary internal and/or external resources will be available to support the timely completion of the project.	
Subtotal	

UW Oshkosh
Office of Sponsored Programs and Faculty Development
Faculty Development Program

Category 4: Project Outcomes

10%

Has the proposer clearly stated tangible and realistic outcomes and the type of evidence to be provided upon project completion?

a. The proposal describes one or more discipline-specific outcomes.	
b. The proposal indicates at least one specific outcome that involves exposure to an audience external to UW Oshkosh.	
Subtotal	

Category 5: Quality of Writing

5%

Has the proposer written a clear, concise, consistent, and specific proposal accessible to a broad audience?

a. The proposal is written concisely and clearly in non-technical and jargon-free language for a general audience.	
b. The proposal is free of typographical errors and grammatical mistakes.	
Subtotal	

Total	
-------	--

Approval

Do you recommend that the FDB fund this proposal? Yes No

Please explain below.

If the proposer has requested 15% CAS, do you recommend that the FDB fund this proposal at this level?

(Ignore if the answer to the previous question is "No") Yes No

Please explain below.

UW Oshkosh

Office of Sponsored Programs and Faculty Development
Faculty Development Program

If you believe the FDB should fund the project, has the proposer justified any requested auxiliary funds?
(Ignore if the answer to Item 1 is “No”)

- No auxiliary funds requested
- Travel funds justified Yes No N/A
- Student worker funds justified Yes No N/A
- Supplies funds justified Yes No N/A

Please explain below.

Technical violations:

Are there any technical violations (eg., double-blind violation, page limit) that make this proposal unfundable?

Please explain below. YES NO

Panelists' comments (Required):

Please enter specific comments related to your ratings identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed activity. A good review is useful to the proposer and helps the subcommittee to make decisions when disparate reviews are received. Please be considerate with your written comments. You are responsible for the professionalism of your feedback to the proposer. Negative feedback is to be accompanied by constructive suggestions.