# UF COLLEGE OF PHARMACY PROSPER EXCELLENCE AWARDS

The Pharmacy Recurring Opportunity Seed Program for Education and Research (***PROSPER***) program is available to all faculty members in the college. The ***PROSPER*** program is funded from the earnings from the on-line (off-book) programs. These funds will be used to support faculty innovation, pilot projects, and various other projects within the college.

The ***PROSPER*** program will focus on three principal award areas:

* [Research Enhancement](#_bookmark0)
* Teaching Innovation and Improvement
* Faculty Development

Polices and Guidelines for each of the three areas will be developed and governed by the following administrative personnel and college committees:

* **Research Enhancement:** Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education and the [College of Pharmacy Research Committee.](http://pharmacy.ufl.edu/the-college/administration/committees/research-committee/)
* **Teaching Innovation and Improvement:** Associate Dean for Curricular Affairs and Accreditation and the [College of Pharmacy Curriculum Committee.](http://pharmacy.ufl.edu/the-college/administration/committees/curriculum-committee/)
* **Faculty Development:** Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and the [College of Pharmacy Faculty Development Committee.](http://pharmacy.ufl.edu/the-college/administration/committees/faculty-development/)

PROSPER proposals not following the guidelines of the three areas listed above will be administratively withdrawn from the current funding review cycle and must be resubmitted in a future cycle. Each Associate Dean will make recommendations from their respective areas to the Executive Committee for final approval.

During any given funding cycle, each ***PROSPER*** program area will be allocated funds in the approximate proportions indicated below. In addition, during any one funding cycle the proportional shares listed below may change to accommodate priorities identified following review of all in-cycle proposals.

1. Research Enhancement (≈70% of allocated ***PROSPER*** dollars)
2. Teaching Innovation and Improvement. (≈20% of allocated ***PROSPER*** dollars)
3. Faculty Development. (≈10% of allocated ***PROSPER*** dollars).

**Funding for PROSPER Teaching Innovation and Improvement, Faculty Development, and Research Enhancement Fast track, Grant review funding, and Clinical Faculty Research seed funding** categories **are available on a rolling basis.** These will be reviewed within approximately one month by an ad hoc review committee.

**Review of Research Seed grants and Bridge funding grants for tenure-track faculty are reviewed in two cycles per year:**

##  Fall Semester

* September: the initial call will go out to faculty with reminders of the funding categories and guidelines
* October: proposal submission
* November: review and notification of awardees and release of funds.

## Spring Semester

* + - January: the initial call will go out to the faculty identifying funding levels in each program area.
		- April: reminder of Research category submission deadline in May
		- May: proposal submission for Research Enhancement awards
		- May-June: review and notification of Research Enhancement awards and release of funds

**Awards are for a maximum of 1 year period ending one year after activation; these would be December 30 for Fall awards and June 30 for Spring awards.** It is expected that the planned project is executed as described in the proposal and the funds fully expended in the budget year. Under extenuating circumstances a no-cost extension request will be considered by the Dean’s Office.”

* The number of proposals funded for each *PROSPER* area will be determined by both the award cap determined in each area (see below) and the total amount of *PROSPER* dollars allocated for a given cycle.
* At any given academic year, a faculty member can be a PI or Co-PI on only **one** proposal in each of the respective areas (Research, Education, Development).
* In any given ***PROSPER*** award category (Research, Education or Development), a faculty member who has received, as PI, a previous ***PROSPER*** award or similar award through any University internal competitive funding programs identified on the Provosts Office website:<http://www.aa.ufl.edu/awards-and-enhancements>will not be eligible in the like funding category only, during the time that award is active. (No-cost extensions are considered an “active” award). Examples of these conflicts within the institution could be:
	+ A faculty member wanting to apply for a ***PROSPER*** development award after receiving a [Faculty Enhancement Opportunity](http://www.aa.ufl.edu/FEO) (FEO).
	+ A faculty member wanting to apply for a ***PROSPER*** Research award after receiving [Opportunity Funds](http://research.ufl.edu/faculty-and-staff/finding-funding/internal-competitive-funding.html) (OF) or [Preparatory Grants](http://research.ufl.edu/research-program-development/research_program_development_docs/CRP_2015.pdf) awards.

**PLEASE NOTE**: Individual faculty should consult with the Dean’s Office to determine eligibility if there is a potential conflict to be considered.

* Review of each respective program area will be based on rubrics established for each program

area (see below) and will be a two-step process

* + Committees will be selected at each cycle by respective administrative personnel and committees and will be determined based on needed expertise for the proposals submitted. Each review team will include at least one member from the respective committees (Research, Curriculum or Faculty Development), as well as senior and junior faculty members from within the college or from outside the College with associated expertise.
	+ To assure funding priorities in any given ***PROSPER*** funding area cycle, final dollar amounts per review cycle and ***PROSPER*** area will be finalized in consultation with each of the administrative coordinators. The Executive Committee of the College will serve as the “council” to review awards and levels of funding.
	+ Final reports, not to exceed 2 pages in length should be submitted within one month after the closure of the award (January 30 or July 30). Theses should be submitted to the respective associate dean/administrative unit. The final report should include explanation of goals or aims achieved, including publications, grant submissions or other milestones achieved as a result of the PROSPER funding.

# RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT AWARDS AND APPLICATION GUIDELINES

Applications for PROSPER Research Enhancement funds will be accepted in 5 categories:

## Clinical Faculty Research Seed awards

## These awards provide resources to clinical faculty to show feasibility and/or obtain preliminary data for applications to AACP, ACCP, ASHP, foundations, or other sources. It is expected that these proposals are submitted at least 6 months before the funding deadline, but that a full application will be submitted to an extramural source within 1 year.

##

## Nontenure track faculty with both clinical effort and scholarly effort included in their assignments are eligible to apply in this category. These will be reviewed by a panel which includes clinical faculty and clinician-scientists. It is expected that these will be submitted in the Fall and Spring cycles, however “off cycle” applications will also be considered. Justification for an off cycle review should be submitted to the Associate Dean for Research prior to submission.

## The expected maximum award in this category is $10,000; larger proposals will be considered . For proposals requesting over $10,000 with justification to the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education.

## Applications in this category are limited to 3 pages which must include:

## One page statement of aims: this should include statement of the aims for the expected “full” application, and a description of the more limited aims/goals to be achieved with the PROSPER funding.

## One page statement of approach including overall strategy for recruitment and statistical analysis of the larger proposed project.

## Statements on the innovation and significance of the project

## Timeline for submission to an external agency (including which agency will be targeted)

## An additional page for the budget is also allowed.

## Revised applications may include a one page Introduction explaining the revisions made.

In the following 4 categories only faculty who are either tenure-track or supported >50% by the college are eligible to compete as PIs. Soft-funded grant-funded) faculty may serve as co-Is, but not as PIs. Faculty will be not be eligible for submission for PROSPER funding while they are PI or co-PI on another PROSPER award, or on a UF Opportunity Fund award or have an active extension of either of these awards; the exception to this will be serving as PI on a Shared Use Award.

## Research Fast track awards: reviewed monthly

These applications must be based on the extramural review of an extramural proposal. These will be reviewed on a monthly basis by the COP Research Committee.

These awards are intended to provide small amounts of money quickly to allow faculty to provide additional data for previously unsuccessful, but generally well-reviewed, applications.

The maximum award in this category is $5000 from PROSPER, which must be matched by the department or a center.

Applications for a fast-track award must include the summary sheet of the reviewed extramural application.

All funded fast track proposals are intended to result in a submitted proposal on a timely basis; this proposal must be submitted for internal review at least 4 weeks prior to the funding agency deadline.

Applications are limited to 3 pages of additional text which must include:

* The Specific aims page of the unsuccessful grant application (with the specific aim to be addressed using PROSPER funds highlighted)
* One page response to review- focused on how PROSPER funding addresses the review
* Brief statement of the approach
* Timeline for experiments and resubmission

## Grant review awards: reviewed monthly

This category is intended to support external review and/or assistance in grantsmanship. These applications will be reviewed on a monthly basis by the COP Research Committee.

This funding mechanism is limited to larger grants in the P or U series or to R grant submissions from assistant or associate professors who are unfunded.

This fund will provide up to $2000 and requires matching funds from the department(s) or center(s).

Applications are limited to 2 pages and must include:

* Summary of the funding source and mechanism
* Summary of grant structure/faculty involved/ overall aims
* Include list of suggested reviewers and their suitability/expertise for this review
* budget

## Research Seed awards:

These proposals should be innovative, interdisciplinary, support college missions, and have strong potential for garnering future funding from external sources. These awards are not intended to supplement existing research programs, but rather to support new, novel research. The focus for funding will be on applications showing the need for preliminary data that will result in proposals to be submitted within 12-18 months of PROSPER award.

Funding is limited to a maximum of $40,000.

Two categories of seed funding will be considered:

* Early stage investigator awards: Applicants who are Assistant or early Associate Professors. In the case of new hires who are still within their start-up package time- frame, the case for how this funding is critical over and beyond the requested start-up package must be made. The justification must include how these funds are necessary to obtain data for a grant submission that cannot be accomplished with the start-up .
* Collaborative Investigator Awards: These may include more senior Associate or full Professors as PIs. These projects should be for new collaborations across departments or for seed funds for applications for large Multi-PI (ie P, U etc) or Center grants. Strong justification for how this will establish a new collaborative area of research is expected.

Applications are limited to 5 pages of text which must include:

* Specific aims
* 2 pages of impact, innovation and approach including rationale for need for this data for the extramural proposal
* Description of the faculty tea/key individuals in place to accomplish goals of the funding
* Budget and timeline for submission of extramural grant

Letter of support from key personnel and biosketches are not included in the 5 page limit.

For faculty that have previously received PROSPER funding in the Seed category or Fast track category as PI, they must provide the following information on the submission resulting from the prior PROSPER funding: UFIRST proposal #, agency Grant #, title, submission date, and abstract.

## Research Bridge Funding.

This category of funding is aimed to support investigators who have shown a history of funding. All levels of tenure track faculty are eligible for this award.

These awards can be sought prior to (but in anticipation of) the expiration of an existing grant, to help ensure continuation of funding (e.g. to avoid loss of personnel on the project). Evidence will be required to show that continued support of an investigator’s research program is being actively pursued.

Funding is limited to a maximum of $40,000.

Applications are limited to 5 pages of text which must include:

* Specific aims
* 2 pages of impact and approach
* Team in place to accomplish goals/ key individuals
* Budget and timeline for re-submission

Evidence of submission for extramural funding, and summary statements when available must be included.

## Shared use awards:

These awards are for the purchase of shared-use major equipment or of large shared-use data sets. In the case or shared use equipment, only equipment of over $100K will be considered. Matching funds of at least 50% of the requested award will be required by PI and/or associated Departments/Centers to be eligible for these funds. In the case of equipment, contributions from appropriate Centers would also be expected.

Applications are limited to 3 pages and must include:

* faculty who will use this resource
* Sustainability plan
* Use in existing projects (funded or not)
* Timeline for new applications that will require this resource

A one-page introduction is allowed for revised applications. This should include responses to the comments in the previous review, and point out the changes in the application

**General Research Enhancement Proposal requirements**:

Formatting requirements: Single spacing; font size no smaller than 11 point; minimum 0.5 inch margins; tables and figure legends can be in 10 point font.

ALL APPLICATIONS FOR PROSPER Research Enhancement Funds must include a cover page including

* the title
* all faculty involved in the proposal
* requested funding amount
* any matching funding associated with the application
* In the case of submissions that include matching funds from the department, the cover page must include the signature of the department chair (ie Fast Track Proposals, Grant review funding or Shared Resources applications)

**PROSPER funds may not be used to cover PI or other faculty salary support, including expenses for consultants (except in the case of grant reviews).** Request for partial (i.e. ≤50%) support of a graduate student stipend or postdoctoral fellow may be requested. Travel expenses to meetings will also not be covered as an expense.

## Proposals must be submitted electronically and emailed in Word or PDF format only as ONE file to: Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education, Maureen Keller-Wood, PhD at kellerwd@cop.ufl.edu and Ms. Jordan Webb-Moore at jwebb@cop.ufl.edu. The PI’s Chair should be copied on all email submissions.

**Review Process**

Proposals submitted to the college’s Office of Research will be reviewed by a faculty review panel. The review committee will consist of members of the Research Committee, with substitutions to prevent conflicts of interest as appropriate. Other external faculty (non-COP UF faculty with appropriate expertise) will be recruited to supply reviews at the discretion of the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education.

The Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education, who will serve as ***ex officio*** chair of the review committee. The committee recommendations will be reviewed by COP Executive Council, who will serve as the final decision point for award amounts and approvals.

## An overall priority score will be assigned to each proposal keeping in mind the following review criteria:

**Significance and Impact: (For fast track/seed/ pilot funding):** Does this study address an important problem? Is the project original, multi/interdisciplinary and innovative? Does the project develop or employ novel concepts, approaches, methodologies, tools, or technologies? What will be the impact of these studies on the methods, technologies, treatments, or preventative interventions that drive this area of research? Do the proposed outcomes represent a new paradigm for concepts in this area of research? Does the project represent a new direction of investigation for the faculty involved, or is it a new collaborative partnership? How will this funding support new applications for funding? Does the proposed project address the College’s and UF’s strategic goals?

**(For bridge funding)** Has the case for needed funding been clearly identified, are supporting documents provided that demonstrate the investigator is continuing to seek additional funding for their project?

**Approach:** Does the application represent a new conceptual/multidisciplinary approach to the identified problem? Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?

**Likelihood of obtaining external support:** Do the investigators present plans to garner extramural support from specific funding agencies? Do they make a cogent argument for the need for this funding to support the submission? Is the proposed timeline reasonable?

**Investigators:** Are the investigators appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the principal investigator and other researchers? Does the investigative team bring complementary and integrated expertise to the project?

**Budget:** Is the requested budget appropriate for the scope of work?

In the case of equipment requests, review will also consider the shared use plan and the plan for maintaining the instrument.

# TEACHING INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT AWARDS AND APPLICATION GUIDELINES

The ***PROSPER*** Teaching Innovation and Improvement Awards will target four areas:

1. **Development of innovative teaching approaches/resources.** These proposals will support development of new teaching approaches that require personnel and equipment support currently not available within the college. The proposals may also support development of teaching resources such as interactive web-based teaching tools (e.g., simulations, gaming, lessons) and videos (e.g., clinical demonstrations) that are beyond the scope of work of the College’s educational technology team. The teaching approach/resources must have potential for being sustainable by the College. The proposal is expected to evaluate the innovation through the Scholarship of Teaching.1
2. **Student Performance Assessment**. These proposals will support development or evaluation of assessment approaches that document student achievement of the College’s educational outcomes. Innovative approaches for documenting and assessing student achievement of

“milestones” and student learning/achievement during “capstones” are included in this category. The assessment approach must have potential for being sustainable by the College. The proposal is expected to evaluate the assessment approach through the Scholarship of Teaching.1

1. **Evaluation of teaching approaches/strategies**. Proposals in this area support the evaluation of a teaching or assessment method being used within a course or across the curriculum. This area is expected to use methodologies common to educational research and accomplish the Scholarship of Teaching.1
2. **Development of Innovative New Elective Courses**. These proposals will support development of new elective courses. The course must meet the criteria the Curriculum Committee has established for elective courses in the new curriculum. Although this category does not require interdisciplinary collaboration, it is encouraged when feasible. The proposal is expected to include a plan for evaluating achievement of the learning outcomes.1,2

## References:

1. Glassick CE. Acad Med. 2000;75:877-880.

1. Poirier T et al. Am J Pharm Educ. 2009;73 (3) Article 55.

All of the above funding areas are equally encouraged during all funding periods.

A Teaching Innovation and Improvement Award will generally be for $5,000 to $10,000 and should not exceed $15,000 and will not cover PI or other faculty salary support.

## *PROSPER* Teaching Innovation and Improvement proposal guidelines and review process:

Faculty interested in submitting a proposal should notify the Associate Dean for Professional Education for information on guidelines and selection procedures. Applications are accepted on a rolling basis.

Proposals must be submitted electronically and emailed in Word or PDF format only as ONE file to: Associate Dean for Professional Education, Shauna Buring, Pharm.D. at sburing@cop.ufl.edu and Ms. Jordan Webb-Moore at jwebb@cop.ufl.edu.

## The PI’s Chair should be copied on all email submissions.

**Formatting requirements:** Single spacing; font size no smaller than 11 point; minimum 0.5 inch margins; tables and figure legends can be in 10 point font.

## Proposals should consist of the following materials in this sequence:

* 1. **Cover Page**: Include title, identify ***PROSPER*** target area (Development of Innovative Teaching Approaches/Resources, Student Performance Assessment, Evaluation of Teaching Approaches/Strategies), list of PIs, co-PIs and all faculty contributing time to the project and their departmental/college affiliations, email address of primary contact PI and budget request.
	2. **Abstract**. Explain the rationale for the work to be accomplished in terms that can be understood by an “intelligent non-expert.”
	3. **Project Description**. Up to four (4) pages of text MAXIMUM describing the project to include the following sections that align with Glassick’s 6 standards for Scholarship of Teaching (Ref: Academic Med. 2000;75: 877-880.) :
		1. Specific Aims/Objectives
		2. Background and Significance
		3. Innovation/Potential Impact of the Teaching Innovation and Improvement
		4. Methodology
	4. **Literature Cited** (no page limit)
	5. **Key Personnel.** A list of the individuals to be involved and details of their participation. Include a **current biosketch** of the Principal Investigator and each of the Co-PIs/Co-Investigators (Brief biosketch and list of education-related projects and initiatives that have been accomplished. Maximum of 1 page for each investigator identified).

## A detailed budget and justification of expenses.

* + 1. Budgets should generally be $5,000 - $10,000 and should not exceed $15,000 for the entire project period.
		2. The budget may include usual resources related to course development and evaluation, and student assessment with the **exception of COP faculty and staff salaries and indirect costs**.
		3. The percent effort of each participating faculty member must be included in the budget justification.
		4. Budgets may be for one year. Extensions will be considered with justification.

## Plans for dissemination.

* + 1. Describe plans for attaining external peer review of the project/disseminating the project results/products. Possible methods include but are not limited to licensing of

educational resources, publishing a peer-reviewed paper describing the project, dissemination via MedEdPortal, and presentation at a national meeting. (up to 1 page).

Submitted Teaching Innovation and Improvement proposals will be reviewed by faculty review panels that will be determined on each review cycle based on expertise needed**.** The review committee will consist of at least two senior and one junior faculty within the college and usually 1-2 reviewers with relevant expertise external to the college, but within the university.

The faculty review panels will make recommendations to the Associate Dean for Professional Education who will also serve as ***ex officio*** chair of the review committee.

## An overall priority score will be assigned to each proposal. Contact the Associate Dean for Professional Education for the rubric that will be used to evaluate proposals. The rubric criteria evaluate the following:

**Significance and Innovation:** Does this project address an important problem or need within Pharm.D. education at a national level? Do the proposed outcomes represent a new paradigm for pharmacy education? Does the proposed project address a need within the COP entry-level Pharm.D. curriculum? What will be the impact of this project on Pharm.D. education? Is the project original, multi/interdisciplinary and innovative? Does the project develop or employ novel concepts, approaches, methodologies, tools, or technologies? Does the project represent a new direction for the faculty involved, or is it a new collaborative partnership?

**Approach:** Does the application show an understanding of related scholarship in pharmacy education? Does the application represent a new conceptual/multidisciplinary approach to the identified problem? Are the conceptual framework, design, and methods adequately developed, well integrated, well- reasoned, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?

**Investigators:** Are the investigators appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the principal investigator and other researchers? Does the investigative team bring complementary and integrated expertise to the project? Is there evidence of the ability of the team of investigators to work together in an interdisciplinary fashion?

**Budget:** Is the requested budget appropriate for the scope of work?

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AWARDS AND APPLICATION GUIDELINES**

## Key Principles of the Award

1. The **PROSPER** Faculty Development Awards are intended to enhance a faculty member’s outcomes related to teaching, research, and scholarship. Faculty members at any academic rank may be considered for an award, but junior faculty with no or little discretionary funding are especially encouraged to apply.
2. Requests should align with the advancement of skills described in one’s Individual Development Plan (IDP) that has been reviewed by your department chair or, in the case of associate and full professors, the development needs identified in the annual report.
3. The Awards may be used in various ways, such as paying for expenses associated with attending organized programs of advanced study, workshops, short training courses or similar learning expenses, consultation or study with leaders of pedagogical and disciplinary trends or helping to increase a faculty member’s exposure to colleagues at other institutions who can be collaborators and role models.
4. Generally, the skills that may be addressed with a Faculty Development Award include updating or revitalizing current skills, developing new skills in a current area, or developing skills to enter into a new area. Examples of skills that may be addressed in a proposal for this Award include:
	1. **Research/Patient Care/Scholarship skills**, such as improving one’s methodological training related to a new research direction or gaining added certification in patient care
	2. **Becoming a better teacher** by focusing on strengthening a faculty member’s teaching abilities, developing new teaching and learning techniques or new ways to assess learning
	3. **Professional skills**, such as improving one’s grant writing, oral presentation abilities, manuscript writing or learning how to mentor others
	4. **Leadership and Management skills**, such as learning how to become more effective in leading and motivating others, budgeting, managing projects and time, organizational abilities
	5. **Interpersonal skills**, such as learning techniques for getting along with others, communicating clearly in writing and/or in conversations
5. Upon completion of an Award, the faculty member will be required to update their IDP to reflect the outcomes associated with the undertaken activities and share the updated IDP with the Deans Office and the Department Chair. For faculty who do not have an IDP, please submit a report.

## Funding Level

Awards are expected to generally be in the range of $2,000 to $5,000 but faculty members may apply for an award in any amount by providing a detailed explanation for requests more than $5,000.

## *PROSPER* Faculty Development proposal guidelines and review process:

Faculty interested in submitting a proposal should notify the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs for information on guidelines, selection procedures and deadlines for any given funding cycle.

Proposals must be submitted electronically and emailed in Word or PDF format only as ONE file to: Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, Rich Segal at segal@cop.ufl.edu and Ms. Jordan Webb-Moore at jwebb@cop.ufl.edu.

## The PI’s Chair should be copied on all email submissions.

**Formatting requirements:** Single spacing; font size no smaller than 11 point; minimum 0.5 inch margins; tables and figure legends can be in 10 point font.

## Proposals should consist of the following materials in this sequence:

1. **Cover Page**: Include title: identify ***PROSPER*** target area (Updating or revitalizing current skills, Developing new skills in a current area, or Developing skills to enter into a new area): name of PI, email address of PI; if a reapplication, when did you previously apply; if you previously submitted a Faculty Enhancement Opportunity (FEO) Application, when was your last submission and was it funded; and total budget request.
2. **Abstract**. Provide **one** paragraph describing your proposed activity in a way that can be understood by colleagues outside your discipline, alumni, and educated members of the general public.
3. **Goals for the Faculty Development Award** (list three to five succinct goals).
4. **Detailed Plan/Activities/Schedules** associated with the Faculty Development Award (plan cannot exceed one calendar year unless approved by the Associate dean for Faculty Affairs prior to submission).
5. List **specific outcomes** of this Award related to your professional growth and development.
6. If you have an Individual Development Plan (IDP), please attach. Note that assistant professors are required to have an IDP. Associate and Full professors who have not been asked to submit an IDP by their chair should attach the section on faculty development (i.e., annual goals) from their last annual report.
7. A detailed **budget and justification** of expenses
	1. Budgets should range between $2,000 and $5,000 but faculty members may apply for an award in any amount by providing a detailed explanation for requests more than $5,000.
	2. Explain whether other funds are available that may be obtained to fund the proposed activity. For faculty in their first three years at COP and if the faculty member was provided a start-up package, the budget justification should include justification of how these funds are needed beyond the start-up package available to the new faculty member.
	3. Budget may include resources for travel, fees/tuition/equipment, supplies, consultants, other (specify) with the exception of faculty/student/staff salaries and indirect costs.
	4. Budgets may be for one year.

Submitted Faculty Development proposals will be reviewed by a faculty review panel that will be determined on each review cycle based on expertise needed**.** The review committee will consist of at least two senior and one junior faculty members from either within or outside of the University.

The faculty review panels will make recommendations to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs who will also serve as ***ex officio*** chair of the review committee.

## An overall priority score will be assigned to each proposal keeping in mind the following review criteria:

**Goals are clear, meritorious and compelling:** How well will the intended activity enhance the faculty member’s outcomes related to teaching, research, and scholarship? How well does the activity align with the advancement of skills described in one’s Individual Development Plan (IDP) or other documentation of career goals?

## Plan is clear and realistic for goal achievement

**Benefits to the applicant’s academic/professional/scholarly growth are clear and specific**

**Need for Funding**: Are other funds available for the proposed activity that the faculty member may obtain?

**Budget justification is clear and appropriate for proposed goals and outcomes:** Is the requested budget appropriate for the scope of work?