

Reassigned Time Awards: Application, Narrative, and Evaluation Rubric

NMU Faculty Grants Committee

APPLICATION

The application must include a narrative that includes the following appendices: *curriculum vitae* (two-page maximum); bibliography of works cited; IRB or IACUC and/or any other required permits (if applicable); and the report for the previous RTA (if applicable). The application must also include an abstract that is 250 words or less. The abstract should include a clear, concise description of the proposed project need/purpose, objectives/methods, and deliverables. Applications with missing materials are ineligible for review. All must be submitted as a single PDF file on Cayuse.

The narrative (six pages maximum) must be in Times New Roman 12-pt. font, double-spaced, and structured according to the following headings and content. Applications whose narratives neglect explicitly to use these headings in the order given here will be subject to disqualification.

HEADING/SECTION	CONTENT
<p>1. Introduction <i>Relative value: 3 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and concise overview of activities, purpose(s), and goals, as well as the specific discipline and/or sub-discipline(s) to which they apply
<p>2. Scholarly/Professional significance <i>Relative value: 6 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed description of the work, specifying its contribution to the discipline and/or to one or more of the four forms of scholarship indicated in the NMU-AAUP Master Agreement: Discovery, Integration, Application, and Teaching • Review of the pertinent and current literature, identifying how the project represents an original contribution to the field or otherwise advances the discipline
<p>3. Methods <i>Relative value: 5 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed description of execution: the activities to be undertaken and a rationale explaining their relevance to the project's stated goals
<p>4. Outcomes/Deliverables <i>Relative value: 5 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear statement of projected (i.e., achievable) outcomes, with supporting documentation in an appendix where applicable (e.g., contract to publish, letter of interest). Outcomes might include, but are not restricted to, a finished article for submission (specifying the venue), conference paper (specifying the venue), practical implementation, and/or some other tangible purpose for the project. Also, applicants should clearly state whether the project is aimed at securing external grants.
<p>5. Applicant Qualifications <i>Relative value: 2 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of the applicant's credentials and past achievements as they relate to the current proposal
<p>6. Timeline <i>Relative value: 2 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table, in two columns, listing the activities to be undertaken and the projected completion dates
<p>7. Justification <i>Relative value: 3 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of request, including number of credits requested, followed by a rationale justifying the time requested in relation to the activities

EVALUATION RUBRIC

The FGC scores all seven sections of the application Narrative. The “points” are fixed values indicating the sections’ relative importance. The criteria for each section are the same: adherence to the Content guidelines, clarity, and persuasiveness. The scoring system is as follows:

Excellent	5
Very Good	4
Good	3
Fair	2
Poor	1

This score (1-5) is multiplied by the relative point value assigned to the section. For example, an application that receives the maximum score of 5 for section #2 would have a total of 30 (5 x 6) for that section, whereas one scoring 4 would have a total of 24. Similarly, a score of 5 for section #6 would amount to 10 (5 x 2), whereas a score of 3 would amount to 6. The seven resulting numbers are combined for the final score (maximum 130). The hypothetical example below assigns a variety of scores to the seven sections. The totals are automatically generated using a formulated spreadsheet:

Criteria	Relative Value	Score (1-5)	Totals (points multiplied by score)
<i>1. Introduction</i>	3	4	12
<i>2. Scholarly/professional significance</i>	6	5	30
<i>3. Methods</i>	5	5	25
<i>4. Outcomes/Deliverables</i>	5	4	20
<i>5. Applicant qualifications</i>	2	4	8
<i>6. Timeline</i>	2	5	10
<i>7. Justification</i>	3	3	9
	26		114
	Total Points		Overall score (130 max)

Having reviewed and discussed the applications and completed the scorecards, the FGC then ranks them, highest to lowest, according to the scores overall. Where there are more applications than can be accommodated by available funding (as determined by the NMU-AAUP Master Agreement), and where a tie must be decided in favor of one application over another, the committee revisits those tied applications to determine which deserves the higher ranking.