



NON-SALARY FINANCIAL SUPPORT GRANTS (NSFSG)

Rowan University has implemented a program that provides an opportunity for all full-time, tenure track faculty to obtain an adjustment of their academic teaching load to accommodate faculty who wish to engage in significant projects related to research, scholarship and creative activity, instructional improvement, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and/or other appropriate endeavors and activities that fall beyond the normal expectations and responsibilities of the faculty (including extraordinary service activities and projects).

Because of the implementation of this program, the Separately Budgeted Research program, the principal means through which faculty formally requested reassigned time and financial support for research projects, has been discontinued. While the reassigned time provided by the SBR program has been supplanted by the adjusted faculty workload policy, an important aspect of the SBR program - providing financial support for faculty to engage in academic scholarship - has not.

In order to provide resources for this aspect of faculty scholarship, the University has provided funding to award non-salary financial support grants for projects to enhance a faculty member's academic scholarship, whether or not they have received an adjusted faculty workload to accommodate research or significant service projects. This policy outlines the procedures to be followed by faculty members in applying for such non-salary financial support starting 2006, and will be reviewed and revised as appropriate for future cycles when necessary.

PURPOSE

Non-salary financial support grants (NSFSG) are intended to support faculty projects which may include the following purposes:

- 1) to advance the full-time faculty member's knowledge in his/her field of expertise;
- 2) to provide "seed" money to support faculty seeking external grants;
- 3) to support the creative activity of faculty in the arts;
- 4) to provide equipment (e.g., hardware and/or software) that will enhance the faculty member's ability to conduct research and produce scholarship;
- 5) to provide financial support for undertaking surveys, acquiring data, and hiring student workers to process data.

FUNDING LEVELS

1) NSFSG are not intended to completely fund an individual's research career but act as a stimulus for attracting additional external support and to supplement and enhance ongoing activity. Therefore any single grant will not exceed \$ 10,000.

2) NSFSG are not intended to supplant departmental or college travel guidelines and procedures, and requests for travel expenses will not be funded by NSFSG

SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS ON
NON-SALARY FINANCIAL SUPPORT GRANT
PROPOSAL PREPARATION & EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Sections of the Proposal

Include the following in the specified order. Detailed information is provided about each item later in these guidelines.

1. Cover page (use attached form)
2. Abstract/ Extended Summary (not to exceed 1 page)
3. Project Description (not to exceed 6 pages)
4. References (not to exceed 2 pages)
5. Budget (use attached form) & Budget justification (1 page)
6. Current Vita / Biographical sketch with publications relevant to this work highlighted – see below for formatting requirements (not to exceed 2 pages per proposal author – PA)
7. Work Samples: Applicants, particularly for creative works proposals, may include up to two materials that demonstrate scientific/artistic excellence/merit or enhances the reviewers understanding of applicant’s ability to carry out the project. Preferred method of including such material is to place them on a website, with a link in the proposal, when practical to do so. Please note that reviewers are not required to examine these materials, therefore, the proposal must be self-contained.

Formatting Requirements for All Proposals:

Margins: One inch in all directions
Fonts: 10 point font or higher
Spacing: Single spacing with one line break between paragraphs
Page Limits: Page limits are upper limits only. Fewer pages may be used, if the nature of the proposed work allows fewer pages to adequately describe the project.

Note: All proposals not adhering to the established formatting and page number restrictions will be returned prior to review for scientific/artistic merit and significance.

Detailed Guidelines in Preparing Individual Sections of the Proposals

Extended Summary: Present a concise, self-contained summary of the project written to an audience of reviewers that may not be familiar with your area of research or discipline. The summary, in general, should address the following, as appropriate by the scope of the proposed work:

1. Statement of problem to be addressed / research question to be studied / nature of creative work to be carried out.
2. Scientific / Social / Artistic significance of the project: why is this project important?
3. Brief description of your proposed solution to the problem or how your proposed research hypothesis will extend the base of scholarly knowledge about the problem. For creative works, brief description of how the work will be carried out.
4. Brief description of the goals & objectives/specific aims of the project as well as the anticipated end results/expected outcomes/dissemination plan.
5. Broader impacts of the project to further
 - a. the proposal authors’ (PAs) professional growth
 - b. the students educational experience
 - c. the university’s mission/ institutional priorities/five year plan;
 - d. the scientific or artistic enhancement within our community.

Project Description

The project description should be written for an audience of colleagues with similar interests and expertise, however, esoteric explanations and jargon should be avoided. Do not exceed 6 pages. Fewer pages may be used – and in fact encouraged – if adequately describes the project. The specific contents of this section, the headings of subsections, etc. should be representative of typical proposals submitted to other funding agencies in your area. PAs are encouraged to have their proposals critically evaluated by their colleagues and/or the grants office before submission. In general, the following should be included:

1. **Introduction:** This section should provide a more detailed background about the project, primarily expanding on the project summary Part 1 and 2 statements. Any bibliography on prior work of the PA as well as those of other people should be summarized here.
2. **Method/ Experimental Procedure / Creative Activity:** provide more detail on the goals and objective of the proposed work and explain the method/procedure/activity that will be carried out, as well as plan for carrying out such activities. Elaborate on expected outcomes of the project. Include a time line of activities.
3. **Broader Impacts:** Expand on Part 5 of the Project Summary. How will the project benefit the PA professionally? How will it benefit students, and more specifically, if and how will students be involved in the project? What will be the benefit of the project to the university, community, and the profession in general?
4. **Qualifications of the PA(s):** Explain why the PA(s) is/are uniquely qualified to conduct this project? If this is work in his/her area of expertise, provide evidence. If this constitutes a new area/departure from his/her expertise area, comment on the reasons for the change in direction and the prospects of success.
5. Elaborate on the end results/expected outcomes/dissemination plan for the outcome.
6. Explain why this work should be funded through this program and what other external funding opportunities exist, if any. Is this proposal asking for a seed grant for a pilot study? Is there no other agency / foundation / institution who would support this line work? What are the chances and sources for obtaining future funding?

References: You may use your preferred style for citing the references, as long as it is consistent throughout the proposal.

Budget: (Use the provided form)

All budget items must clearly and directly support the proposed effort and must be clearly justified. All equipment, books, and other non-expendable supplies purchased with NSFSG funds are and remain the property of Rowan University.

Salaries and Wages: Faculty salary is not permitted. Salaries and wages requested for student workers shall be based on prevailing departmental/college rates.

Fringes Benefits: Fringe benefits for student salaries must be included and calculated at the prevailing student fringe benefit rate.

External Consultant Fees: May be requested to assist in areas of the project where additional expertise is required. Daily rate and number of days working on project must be provided.

Travel: Only travel clearly associated with the research project and not otherwise available through departmental or college travel funds will be considered. All travel should be calculated following the University's daily per diem meal allowances and applicable lodging and transportation policies.

Equipment, Supplies, Materials & Other Direct Costs: All requests for equipment, supplies, materials, hardware, software, and other items directly related to the project must be credible and realistic. Expenses generally provided by the department or college are not permitted, nor those typically covered by personal funds. Therefore, routine photocopying, commuting to/from Rowan, memberships to professional organizations, internet access, etc. are not permitted.

Budget justification: Provide a detailed justification for the project, on one page. For example, if hiring students/external consultants, briefly describe their roles in the project, and provide justification for their compensation. If funding for research travel is requested, explain why travel is essential for the success of the project.

Biosketch:

Provide a brief biosketch in no more than 2 pages.

The biosketch should include the following information only

1. Educational background: Degrees and year in which they are awarded
2. Appointments: in reverse chronological order
3. Publications / Creative Works – Only in citation form
 - i. Related works: The most relevant (at most) five works
 - ii. Other works: Most recent and/or other noteworthy (at most) five works.
4. Synergistic activities: Professional involvements, activities. List most recent, relevant or important five activities
5. Recent and active grants: List all active grants from all sources, as well as the five most recently completed grant work. Include the funding agency, the amount and duration of the grant.

Submission Guidelines and Other Considerations

1. Eight paper copies and one electronic copy should be submitted to the Office of Associate Provost for Research by the submission deadline, which will typically be on or about the third week of classes. Exact date will be announced by the above mentioned office.
2. Requests for post award budget revision must be approved, in writing, by the Associate Provost for Research.
3. All NSFSG must be expended by the dates established by the Division of Administration and Finance, but no later than June 30th of the following year.
4. Approved proposals that seek to use animals or human subjects must include verification that the research processes and procedures have been submitted for approval by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) or the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). Awards will be given pending approval by the IRB or IACUC. IRB and IACUC guidelines and application forms can be obtained from the Office of Associate Provost for Research (x4053). They may also be downloaded electronically from the Grants Office web site through the Rowan Home Page.
5. Grant recipients will submit a final report on the results of the grant to the Associate Provost for Research. This report will include a list of presentations, publications and/or grant applications that resulted from the NSFSG.

Evaluation of the Proposals

The goal of the following process is to ensure a fair, unbiased and accurate review of the proposed work. The work will be reviewed by colleagues who are knowledgeable about the subject matter (primarily for technical / artistic merit), but also by faculty members whose expertise lie in other areas.

The senate will assign one member from each college (three from LAS – math& science, social sciences and humanities) to a committee for reviewing the proposals. Each member of this committee will then seek the reviews of at least two reviewers whom s/he believes to be knowledgeable about the subject matter. The PA may include the names of five suggested reviewers within the proposal – listed in alphabetical order of last names – of which the committee member may (and usually will) select any two. It is the committee member's responsibility to ensure that a fair review of the proposal is obtained. Therefore, the reviewer selection ultimately rests with the committee member, who may seek other reviewers should s/he so deem appropriate. The reviewers may be housed outside of PA's immediate program / college (for example, an electrical engineering proposal may be reviewed by a physics or computer science faculty, an education proposal may be reviewed by a psychology or sociology faculty, etc.). In rare cases when such a reviewer cannot be found on campus, reviews from off-campus experts may be sought.

The committee member will also review all proposals assigned to him/her for a total of three in-field reviews. These three reviews will judge the proposal on a scale of 1 – 5 (see the evaluation form):

- 1 – Poor: Proposal is lacking components, no coherent plan, poorly prepared proposal in many aspects
- 2 – Fair: Proposal has some ideas, however these are not well developed or well planned.
- 3 – Good: Proposal has good ideas and a plan. However, some key components are not well developed
- 4 – Very Good: Proposal has very good ideas, well thought out plan, with wide reaching broader impacts. A competitive proposal that should be funded, if funds are available.
- 5 – Excellent: Proposal addresses very timely and important issues, with a clear, convincing and well thought out plan. The proposed work, if successful, will have significant and broad impact not only to the PA, but to the students, university, community and/or profession in general.

The committee member will bring these reviews to the panel meeting to be held approximately three weeks after the submission deadline. Each committee member may also review additional proposals, if they are within his/her area of interest. This will allow sufficient redundancy that each proposal is evaluated by as many competent reviews as possible. All committee members shall read the one-page extended summaries of all proposals to ensure meaningful discussion of the proposals and their broader impacts at. At the time of panel meeting, the committee members will put all proposals into one of three groups: highly recommended, recommended and non-competitive, based on all reviews received. Those proposals that receive “three” or more “Excellent” will be placed in the “Highly recommended” category. Those that receive at least one “Excellent” will be placed in the “Recommended” category. If funds are available to fund all of the highly recommended proposals, the committee will then start including those proposals that received at least “two excellent” and one “very good”, from the recommended category and will continue to rank proposals until all funds are spent. If funds are not sufficient to fund even the highly recommended proposals, the committee will discuss and rank these proposals, until all funds are spent.

A copy of all completed recommendation / review forms will be returned to the PI along with the funding decision. The identity of the reviewers will not be revealed. The Dean of the Graduate School and an additional dean from the Dean's Council will also be present at the panel meeting. The Dean of the Graduate School will moderate the panel, however, s/he will not be evaluating the proposals, nor will vote. The representative of the Dean's Council will also be observing to ensure that the process is duly followed and will also refrain from voting. The final list of proposals recommended for funding will then be given to the Provost.



NON-SALARY FINANCIAL SUPPORT GRANT
COVER PAGE

Applicant		Department	
Phone		Email	
Project Title			

Have you received an NSFG grant before? Yes No

Has prior funding been awarded for this project? Yes No

If yes, which aspect(s) have been funded in the past? From what source?

Please specify which new aspects of the project are currently proposed for funding.

Please specify the presentations, publications and external grant submissions that have resulted from the prior grant.

Amount Requested: _____ Start Date: _____ End Date: _____

Suggested Reviewers Name & E-mail address (in alphabetical order of last name):

Final Rating: _____ Reviewers Comments: _____

Recommended for Funding Yes No Amount Awarded: _____

Non-Salary Financial Support Grant Budget

Budget Items

Student Salaries _____
 Student Fringes _____
 Consultant Fees _____
 Project Travel _____
 Equipment _____
 Supplies/Materials _____
 Other _____

Total Project Cost _____

Other Sources of Funding for Project
(List Source & Amount)

Budget Explanation (Attach additional pages if necessary)

Salary and Fringes

Number of Undergraduate Students _____
 Wage Rate _____ # of Hours _____ Total Wages _____

Number of Graduate Students _____
 Wage Rate _____ # of Hours _____ Total Wages _____

Fringe Benefit Rate Used _____

External Consultants

Consultant Name _____	Consultant Name _____
Daily Rate _____ # of Days _____	Daily Rate _____ # of Days _____
Total Fees _____	Total Fees _____

Project Travel

Airfare/trainfare _____
 (or) Mileage _____
 Lodging _____
 Per diem meals _____
 Other _____ Describe _____

Total Project Travel _____

Narrative description of Equipment, Supplies/Material & Other Direct Costs:

Recommendation Form for Rowan University Non-Salary Financial Support Grant

PA Co-PA (if any)		Date	
------------------------------	--	-------------	--

Proposal Title	
---------------------------	--

To the reviewer: Non Salary Financial Support Grant (NSFSG) Program requests your recommendation regarding the above named proposal. The NSFSG program provides modest support and seed grants (less than \$10K) to Rowan faculty in order to foster research and creative activity. Your recommendation will be used to help the grant committee assess the merit of this proposal. Your feedback to the PA will also serve as a mechanism for improving the quality of submitted proposals and prospects for future grant proposals. Please provide your honest assessment of the proposal and return it to the NSFSG committee member who requested your review. In particular, please

- Provide your relationship to the PA, and your own qualifications for assessing this proposal below.
- Score the proposal in each of the 10 criteria listed (items 1 – 10) on a scale of 1 -5: 1= poor, 2= fair, 3=good/satisfactory, 4=very good, 5= excellent/exemplary.
- Provide the rationale for your score for each criterion. Your specific comments will be greatly appreciated by the committee, as well as by the PA for improving the proposal for future applications.
- Provide an overall score (item 11 on the form) of the proposal
- Provide any additional comments and/or rationale for your overall score

The evaluation form on the back of this page will be returned to the PA.. Please include your name only in the field below, and not on the back of this form.

Reviewer's Name & Title		Reviewer's Affiliation	
Reviewer's email		Reviewer's Phone #	

Reviewer's relationship to PA (departmental colleague, re- search collaborator, etc)	
Reviewer's qualifications for assessing the specific nature of the proposed project.	

Evaluation Form

Please use the following grading: 1= poor, 2= fair, 3=good/satisfactory, 4=very good, 5= excellent/exemplary.

Item	CRITERIA	SCORE
1	Qualifications / Capabilities of the PI – How do you rate the PA’s qualifications and potential for conducting this project as proposed. Comments:	
2	Originality / Innovation – Is this project innovative rather than a rehashing of similar re-search/creative activity? Comments:	
3	Professional Impact – Potential for the project leading to significant advancement in a line of re-search or creative activity. Comments:	
4	Institutional Impact – Potential for benefiting the mission of Rowan University. Comments:	
5	Educational Impact – Potential for directly benefiting students via research experience, including them in the creative / artistic work, etc. Comments:	
6	Budget - Realistic and necessary as proposed. Make suggestions otherwise. Comments:	
7	Quality of the Proposal –Is the proposal well written with appropriate content, style and language in comparison to other proposals in this specific subfield / discipline. Comments:	
8	Potential for Future Funding - Potential for leading to outside funding. Put N/A if you believe outside funding is usually not available, or very rare, for this type of effort. Comments:	
9	Scope – Rate how realistic the proposed activities, timeline & requested funding are to accomplish the project. Comments:	
10	Deliverables – Rate quality/quantity of the proposed deliverable activities (caliber of proposed pa-pers, presentations, recitals, etc.) in comparison to comparable peer activity deliverables. Comments:	
11	Overall Merit – Your overall score for this proposal in comparison with contemporary activity in the discipline / specific subfield. Comments:	

Additional written comments, which may be attached, will be greatly appreciated by the PA.