

Faculty Research and Instructional Development (FRID) Request for Proposal

Revised: February 2019

The Committee:

The Faculty Research and Instructional Development Committee (the Committee) is comprised of seven faculty members appointed by Faculty Senate from all four colleges and a variety of disciplines.

- 1 member – College of Fine Arts
- 1 member – College of Business
- 2 members – College of Education and Technology
- 3 members – College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Committee members will not participate in the evaluation of a proposal in which he/she, or an immediate family member, is a principal investigator or co-principal investigator.

Eligibility:

All full-time faculty are eligible to submit a proposal for consideration.

Competitive proposals will have priority with preference given to faculty that are in their first to third year of service at the University.

Call for Proposal:

The call for proposals is sent to all faculty in the spring semester of each year.

Applicants must identify **ONE** category they would like their proposal reviewed for (Research or Instructional).

Only one individual proposal, and one joint proposal, per faculty member will be accepted.

Funding Period:

Funds will be available from July 1st through June 30th (the University's fiscal year) following the spring of submission.

Funds must be expended within the University's fiscal year. Any funds remaining after June 30th will be forfeited. Extensions are not possible.

Notes and Suggestions:

The Committee would like to encourage you to work with the chair of your department on your proposal and to request assistance with your budget from the office of Sponsored Projects to help ensure a strong proposal.

Proposal Guidelines:

Proposals that do not adhere to the provided guidelines will not be considered for funding by the committee.

Prepare a non-technical proposal that clearly and specifically describes your project to a person **outside** of your field of expertise.

Define any technical terms or jargon used in your proposal that may be unknown to an outsider.

Funding requests are limited to \$5,000.

One **ORIGINAL** proposal, complete with signatures on the Cover Page, must be hand delivered to the office of Sponsored Projects by 5 p.m. on the date posted in the request for proposals.. The office is located in the Administration Building, Room 101.

Budget Guidelines:

Proposals must follow the purchasing guidelines for the University.

Personnel:

Student involvement is encouraged.

Faculty and/or staff salaries and/or release time are **not** allowed.

Equipment: (see University guidelines)

All three must be true:

A single item whose cost exceeds \$1,000,

An item that has a shelf life of at least one year, and

A University inventory tag can be affixed to the item.

Supplies and Expenses:

Expendable supplies such as folders, pens, paper, and such should be provided by the department.

Gift cards are **not** an allowable expense.

Services:

Consultants' fees to cover external professional services that are not readily available at the University.

Consultants may not be ENMU employees.

Travel:

Travel is allowable, but may not exceed 25% of the total requested budget, unless it is required for data collection.

Travel expenses must adhere to the current University Travel Policy, including mileage, meals, hotel, and/or the per diem rate. *Please see the ENMU Travel Policy.*

*Note: since limited funds are available, we encourage you to seek additional funds for travel from other sources.

Specific Requirements:

Proposals that do not adhere to the provided guidelines will not be considered for funding by the committee.

The proposal should be completed in the FRID Application Template provided in the request for proposal email.

All proposals should follow the instructions in the FRID Application Information and Instruction document, also provided in the request for applications email. Additional information for each section of the narrative is provided below. If you have any questions, please contact the office of Sponsored Projects.

Background – relevant research, this section should provide a clear and thorough context for the proposed project that is understandable to someone outside of the field of study.

Objectives/Goals – the proposal should clearly explain the project objectives and goals. Describe and provide the rationale for each.

Methodology and Feasibility – the narrative should provide a clear explanation of the proposed methodology and feasibility. The proposal should document the required resources are available or attainable.

Significance and Impact – the proposal should clearly define the importance and impact of the project to the field of study (discipline).

Expected Outcomes – the proposal should clearly identify the potential of the activity to enhance or create a minimum of two of the following: external funding, scholarly or creative product, or instructional innovation. Please state in relation to proposed outcomes how two of these would be completed.

Review Criteria:

Proposals in each category will be considered based on their merits according to the criteria listed in the rubric (attached).

Is the proposal complete, well-written, well thought out, consistent, and reasonable?

Are the budget and proposal consistent? Do they adhere to the maximum funding limit?

Does the proposer have the expertise to carry out the project?

Will the activity enhance instruction at ENMU?

Does the activity enhance the department and/or the University?

Writing Technique – writing should be clear, correct and coherent.

Organization should be logical and consistent.

Budget and Justification – the budget and justification should be thorough and adhere to the guidelines for the program.

Reports: (A template will be provided approximately 30 days prior to the date the reports are due)

Mid-term Report is due **December 31st**.

Final Reports are due no later than **July 31st**. Each principal investigator is required to submit a one-page summary of the project. If a paper or presentation is given as a result of the project, a copy should be submitted with the report.

	Exemplary (3 PTS)	Adequate (2 PTS)	Needs Improvement (1 PT)	Missing (0 PTS)
Background				
Background provides a clear and thorough context for the proposed project.	Clearly and logically explained.	Explained, but lacks clarity or could use more development.	Only vaguely explained, lacks detail, development, or logic.	Is not adequately explained.
Background discussion is provided in a manner that is easily understandable to someone outside of the field of study, free of jargon or other discipline-specific information.	Easily understandable to scholars outside of the field of study.	Generally understandable to scholars outside of the field of study, but with some lapses.	Only vaguely understandable and difficult to follow to scholars outside of the field of study.	Not understandable to scholars outside of the field of study.
Objectives/Goals				
Objectives and goals are clearly explained.	Clearly and logically explained.	Explained, but lacks clarity or could use more development.	Only vaguely explained, lacks detail, development, or logic.	Is not adequately explained.
A clear rationale is provided for each goal or objective.	Well-developed and clearly explained for each.	Provided, but lacks clarity or could use more development.	Only vaguely explained, lacks detail, development, or logic	Is not adequately provided, or not provided for each goal or objective.
Methodology and Feasibility				
Provides a clear explanation of the proposed methodology.	Clearly and logically explained.	Explained, but lacks clarity or could use more development.	Only vaguely explained, lacks detail, development, or logical sequence.	Is not adequately explained.
Access to the appropriate facilities, equipment, and resources to complete the project is acquired or attainable.	Access is clearly evident.	Access is suggested but uncertain.	Access is only vaguely suggested or discussed.	Access is not adequately demonstrated.
Any required authorizations for special procedures have been obtained or addressed (e.g., Human Subjects, Animals, access to external facilities or collections, etc.)	Authorizations are obtained, fully addressed, or not required.	Authorizations are addressed but uncertain.	Authorizations are only vaguely suggested or discussed.	Authorizations are not adequately demonstrated.
Significance and Impact				
The proposal clearly defines the importance and impact of the project to the field of study.	Both are clearly defined and explained.	Both are defined and explained, but could use more development.	One is well defined and explained while the other is not addressed, or both are only vaguely defined.	Are not adequately defined and explained.

Expected Outcomes				
Proposed research has the ability to become a long-term research program/opportunity.	Clearly identified and explained	Indicated, but could use more development	Only vaguely suggested, lacking in detail or development	Is not adequately demonstrated
Proposer indicates there will be products that will result in external visibility as a direct result of the project (presentations, student research conference participation, publications, patents, art shows, exhibits, films, performances, or improved instructional practices, etc.).	Clearly identified and explained	Indicated, but could use more development	Only vaguely suggested, lacking in detail or development	Is not adequately demonstrated
There is a potential for the project to generate external funding.	Clearly identified and explained	Indicated, but could use more development	Only vaguely suggested, lacking in detail or development	Is not adequately demonstrated
Writing Technique				
Writing is clear, correct and coherent.	Fully understandable; well phrased.	Mostly understandable; adequately phrased.	Vaguely understandable; problematic phrasing.	Not understandable; poor phrasing.
Organization is logical and consistent.	Entirely logical and consistent.	Mostly logical and consistent.	Vaguely logical with some inconsistencies.	Neither logical nor consistent.
Uses approved style, font (Arial 12-point) and grammar.	0 stylistic or grammatical errors.	1-2 stylistic or grammatical errors.	3-5 stylistic or grammatical errors.	>5 stylistic or grammatical errors.
Budget and Justification				
Budget and justification are thorough and adhere to the guidelines for the program.	Thorough explanation, entirely adherent to program guidelines.	Adequate explanation, meet program guidelines.	Inadequate explanation but adhere to program guidelines, or adequate explanation but do not adhere to program guidelines.	Inadequate explanation and do not adhere to program guidelines.