

Nova Southeastern University
President's Faculty Research and Development Grant
FY2013 Competition

Grant Application Guidelines and Procedures

Due Date:
Friday, March 16, 2012 - 5:00 p.m.

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction.....	3
Application and Review Procedures.....	4
Implementation Timeline	4
Funding Priorities.....	5
Eligibility	5
Application Procedures.....	5
Proposal Format.....	5
Required Academic Unit Dollar Match	7
Activities Eligible/Ineligible for Funding.....	8
Proposal Review Process	8
Award Ceremony	9
Post Award Procedures.....	9
Compliance Procedures	10
Project Period and Extensions	10
Creating a Budget	10
Expense and Program Income	11
Final Report	11
Contact Information.....	13
Appendices.....	14
Appendix A: PFRDG Application.....	15
Appendix B: Reviewer Proposal Rating Form	23
Appendix C: Pre-Screening Proposal Checklist	25

INTRODUCTION

To meet the needs of its many constituencies, the University has developed a Mission Statement that addresses the contemporary needs of students, faculty and staff, and community members throughout South Florida, other areas in Florida, and other states and international locations served through distance education:

Nova Southeastern University, a private, not-for-profit institution, offers a diverse array of innovative academic programs at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels, complementing on-campus educational opportunities and resources with accessible distance learning programs, and fostering intellectual inquiry, leadership, and commitment to community through engagement of students and faculty in a dynamic, life-long learning environment.

As one of many means used to address the University's Mission Statement and specifically the issue on how the University "is fostering intellectual inquiry, leadership, and commitment to community" President Ray Ferrero, Jr. initiated the President's Faculty Scholarship Award Program in 1999 (now the President's Faculty Research and Development Grant). The Grants are designed to bring recognition and funding to the University's faculty as they attempt to secure resources in support of research activities. The program is proactive in terms of providing impetus and direction toward research activities and in turn the program receives a considerable level of attention by the University's administration as a means of faculty support.

Since the start of the Grants, the Nova Southeastern University Board of Trustees has voted to allocate \$2,000,000 to create the President's Faculty Research and Development Grant (PFRDG). Fifty percent of the monies used to fund the awards come from the interest generated from this account and the other fifty percent comes from the winning faculty members' academic units, represent new allocations for faculty development and do not diminish existing resources of faculty support in the unit.

Each spring full-time faculty across the university compete for the Grants that can reach a maximum amount of \$10,000.00. In the twelve-year history of making these awards, 660 faculty members have shared \$2,448,377 in financial support of research and scholarship at NSU. Grant winners have come from each of the university's sixteen academic units.

With these dollars, the award-winning faculty members have conducted studies to shed new light on important topics such as:

- Social Capital, Performance and the Internationalization of Emerging Market Firms
- Marital Therapy for Couples at Risk with One or More Children Diagnosed with Autism
- The Effects of a Writing Scoring Guide and a Student Model on Writing
- Vision screening for pre-school children
- High parental conflict in divorcing families
- The application of molecular methods to investigate the levels of fecal contamination on south Florida beaches

- The impact of pharmaceutical care on congestive heart failure patients and the effectiveness of rehabilitation
- The determination in palpatory diagnosis and manipulative treatment by osteopathic physicians and physical therapists
- Differential diagnosis of malingered brain injury using intelligence tests, accommodative therapy for delaying presbyopia

The findings generated from these studies not only contribute to society's knowledge on these subjects, but the research will also be used to inspire and inform the NSU students who attend classes given by these faculty members.

For more information regarding the awards, please contact Gary S. Margules, Sc.D., Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer (VP RTT), at 954-262-7507 or margules@nova.edu.

For revisions and updates throughout the competition year please refer to: www.nova.edu/PFRDG

APPLICATION AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

The FY2013 President's Faculty Research and Development Grant (PFRDG) implementation timeline is as follows:

- March 16, 2012 – electronic and hard copy proposals due to the OGC by 5:00 p.m.
- March 23, 2012 – per-screening of applications completed and proposals submitted electronically to reviewers
- April 20, 2012 – ratings submitted by panel chairs to the OGC
- April 30, 2012 – final results presented to the President
- May 2, 2012 – final award selections made by the President
- May 8, 2012 – notification letters sent to the principal investigators
- May 24, 2012 (tentative) – PFRDG Award Ceremony and Reception
- June 1, 2012 – earliest date FY2013 awards may begin

FUNDING PRIORITIES

During each year of operation the university President presents annual grants of a maximum of \$10,000.00 each to selected faculty. Funding is prioritized for work that:

1. is deemed scholarly in nature by the applicant and his/her Dean;
2. is initiated by a faculty member or research scientist and approved by his/her Dean;
3. represents new or expanded activity for the university;
4. falls within university and the academic unit identity, goals and mission;
5. contains a meaningful evaluative component proposed by the applicant;
6. will expand the knowledge and understanding of the academic community; and

7. will be disseminated, through professional review, outside of the university.

Funding will be prioritized for proposed work that in facilitates faculty conducting traditional scholarly research projects, for significant educational and program development, and for activities that expand understanding and increase the body of knowledge associated with a given profession or professions. Special attention will be given to activities that include an interdisciplinary component while achieving the above stated objectives.

ELIGIBILITY

All full-time NSU faculty members and full-time research scientists are eligible to apply. Additionally, if an applicant is serving as a reviewer for the competition, he or she is also eligible to submit an application. However, research scientists who are currently 100% grant funded and do not possess any non-sponsored effort will have their eligibility to serve as a reviewer and/or applicant assessed on a case-by-case basis. These individuals should contact Dr. Gary Margules, Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer (954-2626-7507, margules@nova.edu) for additional information and guidance.

Applicants who have received a PFRDG in past competitions also are eligible to apply. However, if an applicant's FY2013 proposal is recommended for funding and the applicant currently has an active PFRDG award from a previous funding cycle, the status of that award will be reviewed to learn if the applicant's earlier project will need to be continued beyond June 30, 2012. The President makes the final selection of the award winners and part of his discretionary process includes a review of applicants with open, continuing awards from previous year's competitions.

Applicants should **not** submit their application for funding to **both** the PFRDG and the NSU/Coordinating Council of Broward Quality of Life Community Based Applied Research Grant, but should select the program that best fits the nature of their research. Information about the Coordinating Council of Broward Quality of Life Community Based Applied Research Grant Application and Review Procedures can be accessed at <http://qol.nova.edu/>.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES

Proposal format - Written proposal narratives must not exceed 10 single spaced pages of 12 point font. This includes the budget and timeline information, however, excludes the application face page, title page, dean's commitment form, references, curriculum vitae, and appendices. One copy of the proposal must be submitted electronically to PFRDG@nova.edu and one paper copy must be received by Friday, March 16, 2012, at 5:00 p.m., in the NSU Office of Grants and Contracts, located at University Park Plaza. Only a paper copy of the proposal should be submitted to the Office of Grants and Contracts. Computer disk, Zip disk, CD Rom, etc. should not be included with the paper copy submission.

The electronic proposal must be submitted **via email with only one file attached:**

- *PFRDG Application* – submit only one file in the pdf form (See Appendix A for a sample).

Specific instructions for proposal preparation and format are outlined in the required forms.

Dean(s) Commitment Form – This form must be included with the **paper copy of the application only**, and is available at the PFRDG website [www.nova.edu/PFRDG]. See Appendix A for a sample. Every academic unit participating in the collaboration must receive the respective Dean's approval, which must include the following:

- A. Approval and support for the proposed work, including approval for the faculty member to devote a portion of his/her non-sponsored effort to the project.
- B. Commitment to the indicated match (exact dollar match amount is required)
- C. Commitment of all other resources (e.g., space, equipment, etc.) necessary to successfully carry out the project

Collaborative Projects - According to NSF's Grant Procedure Guidelines: "A collaborative proposal is one in which investigators from two or more [academic units or] organizations wish to collaborate on a unified research project." This collaboration should work towards a common goal, be more effective with the involvement of multiple investigators and advance the mission of all participating units and/or organizations. A project identified by the applicant as a collaborative project must demonstrate this level of true collaboration by including a description of the role of all collaborators on the project within the narrative. Collaborative projects with entities internal and external to the university are encouraged and will receive the additional 5 points.

Note: Whether or not an academic unit collaborates with one academic unit or five academic units, the proposal can only receive a maximum of 5 extra points for collaboration. **In addition, it will be the decision of the review panel to determine if the proposal is a true collaboration and should receive the additional 5 points.**

Projects Involving Students – Student involvement should pertain to one or more students who will benefit from this project and be involved at the author-level (e.g. by participating in the production a paper, poster or presentation from the project's results). A project identified by the applicant as a project that involves students must include a description of the students' roles on the project within the narrative. Projects that involve students at the author-level will receive the additional 5 points.

Note: Whether or not an investigator involves one student or five students in the project, the proposal can only receive a maximum of 5 extra points for student involvement. **In addition, it will be the decision of the review panel to determine if the proposal meets the criteria for student involvement and should receive the additional 5 points.**

Projects Involving Consultants - Consultants are members of a particular profession or possess a special skill and who are not employees of the NSU. Costs of consultant services are allowable

when reasonable in relation to the services rendered. Payment for consultant services should be comparable to the normal or customary fees charged and received by the consultant for comparable services (OMB Circular A-21, NSF Grant Procedures Guide).

Note: Anticipated consultant services must be justified and information furnished on each individuals' expertise, primary affiliation, daily compensation rate, and the number of days of expected service. Consultants' travel costs, including subsistence, may be included. If the applicant's project is awarded, the consultant will be asked to provide his/her insurance information and complete an independent consulting agreement.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Health Professions Division (HPD) Research Committee Review - While IRB and HPD Research Committee review and approval is not required prior to notification of grant award, it is recommended that applicants review the IRB and HPD Research Committee policies and procedures that may aid in the development of their proposal. These materials may be found at their respective websites; IRB [www.nova.edu/irb], and HPD Research Committee [http://hpd.nova.edu/hpdresearch/hpdresearch_committee]

REQUIRED ACADEMIC UNIT DOLLAR MATCH

Submissions must be endorsed by the Dean(s) of the academic unit(s) in which the project will be administratively housed. Every academic unit participating in the collaboration must receive the respective Dean's signature on the *Dean's Commitment Form*, **whether or not the academic unit is providing dollar or resource support**. This form indicates the Dean(s)' approval for the faculty member to devote a portion of his/her non-sponsored effort to the project and must include the principal investigator/co-principal investigator's name, title of the proposal, and type of commitment (if applicable). This endorsement must include a commitment from the Dean(s) to fund the proposed work with at least a dollar for dollar match (must include the exact dollar amount match). Note: The matching dollars from the academic unit(s) must represent new allocations for faculty development and must not diminish existing resources for faculty support in the academic unit(s). Moreover, a commitment from the Dean(s) of all other resources (for example, space, equipment, etc.) necessary to carry out the project must be included. For example, if six faculty members from six different academic unit(s) are applying together, six separate Deans' signatures are required. The Dean's Commitment Form is available on the PFRDG website [www.nova.edu/PFRDG].

It is strongly suggested that participating Deans discuss their commitments prior to the proposal submission. However, if due to unforeseen reasons it is not possible to identify the exact match arrangements at the time of submission, the following statement should be included in the Dean's Commitment Form: "Should the proposal be awarded, the exact match will be determined as soon as possible after the award announcement." In addition, principal investigators who have applied for an external grant, which requires a match, and are awaiting disposition of their PFRDG award, may request consideration to use the pending PFRDG funds in order to meet the external grant match requirement. Such requests must be submitted to the Office of Grants and Contracts. The Office of Grants and Contracts will be responsible for

obtaining approval from Dr. Gary S. Margules, Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer, prior to the PFRDG submission. If approved, the Dean must note on the Dean's Commitment Form, that in the event the external grant is not funded the Dean will assume responsibility for meeting the match requirement as outlined above.

ACTIVITIES ELIGIBLE/INELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

The following activities are examples viewed to be acceptable expenditures for PFRDG awards:

- Work Study assistance¹
- Other temporary employee assistance.
- Equipment to be university property. Applicants are permitted to submit a brief quote (no more than one page) within their appendices to further justify their budget costs.
- Instruments, including test materials or other specialized materials.
- Incentive payment to human subjects involved in the research. This includes direct costs for items such as stipends, registration fees, travel allowances and/or other incentives (i.e. gift cards) paid to human subjects involved in the research project. An average incentive payment normally does not exceed \$20.00 per visit.
- Special promotional activities (i.e., advertising for special clients or student's participation, special seminars or conferences to promote activities, etc.).
- Focused travels for specific consultations/collaborations.
- Travel for formal presentation of scholarly work in professional venues.
- Travel to collect data.

The following activities **will not be** supported through the President's Faculty Research and Development Grant:

- Faculty development travel (i.e., attendance at professional meetings when not presenting).
- Faculty release time.
- Payment of regular full-time or part-time employees and/or enhancement of full-time or part-time faculty cannot be compensated. Student employees will be compensated through the work study program.
- Cash advances for any non-travel related expenses.
- Payments to collaborating institutions, which exceed 30% of the total project costs (i.e., if a project is awarded \$10,000 no more than \$3,000 may be awarded to a sub-recipient). This does not include payments to consultants and vendors.

¹“Student employees are permitted to work up to 20 hours a week when classes are in session and up to 37.5 hours a week when classes are not in session. The PI will determine the salary range which must be at least minimum wage. The PI must contact Patricia Chin in the Office of Student Employment after his/her account with OGC has been set up in order to create the student employment position for the award.”

PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

All proposal submissions will be pre-screened, using the *Pre-Screening Proposal Checklist* (see Appendix B) upon receipt to ensure that the proposals comply with the award guidelines. If the proposal is not in compliance, it will be returned to the applicant without review by March 23, 2012; proposals in compliance will be forwarded electronically to a review panel. **If an applicant wishes to have his/her proposal pre-screened before the deadline, it must be submitted at least 24 hours in advance of the deadline.**

Proposals will be reviewed and rated by a review panel comprised of faculty members with research experience who will review all proposals and collaboratively determine the rating and ranking for each. The review panel will be comprised of NSU faculty members from outside the applicant's college. Each panel will have a chair that will be nominated by the Deans and chosen by the VP-RTT. Panel chairs will not score the proposal formally, but will be extremely familiar with each assigned application. Panel chairs will be responsible for facilitating the panel review sessions, as well as summing, ranking and reconciling the award recommendations. The final summative score will be submitted to the OGC by the chair thereby attesting to the validity of the scores. The reviewers from each university academic unit must maintain a full-time faculty or research scientist position within the university and be engaged in faculty or research activities (i.e., teaching, supervision of students, research, etc.) at the university.

Reviewers will adhere to a strict time line for reading and evaluating the proposals. Attention to proper grammar and language usage should be of high priority. It is strongly recommended that the proposal be edited or proofread by a colleague. A sample of the *Proposal Rating Form* is located in Appendix C.

Once all reviews are complete, the OGC will tabulate the Proposal Rating Forms and submit a completed report to the VP-RTT, who will present the highest ranked proposals to the President. The President will make the final selection of this year's award winners by May 2, 2012. Notification letters will be mailed to all applicants by May 8, 2012. All applicants will be provided their final score in these letters and all funded projects can begin June 1, 2012, pending compliance with post-award procedures.

Please be aware that the President's Faculty Research and Development Grants should not be evaluated on the level of funding an individual may have for other projects locally or federally funded. Each project or submission is to be graded on its own merits, and not on past or present funding.

AWARD CEREMONY

Each year the President hosts an award ceremony to acknowledge all the participants in the PFRDG competition. It is a wonderful opportunity for the applicants to meet their colleagues as well as for the administration to acknowledge the participants hard work and dedication to the university. The date and location of the award ceremony are TBD and will be posted on the PFRDG website, www.nova.edu/PFRDG.

POST-AWARD PROCEDURES

To initiate the post-award phase of the PFRDG, awardees must contact Dr. Gary S. Margules, Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer (VP-RTT) to schedule a meeting to discuss their research project. At the time of award notification, the applicants will be provided a list of comments from the reviewers regarding his/her project. Before meeting with Dr. Margules, a written report outlining in detail responses to the reviewers comments will be prepared and sent via an email attachment to margules@nova.edu. A meeting may be scheduled to discuss the report and what revisions, if any, need to be made to the project.

COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES

Applicants who receive PFRDG awards are to follow the established procedures in their respective academic units concerning, but not limited to, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the Health Professions Division (HPD) Research Committee, if applicable. Information related to these policies and procedures are available at their respective websites: IRB [www.nova.edu/irb] and HPD Research Committee [www.hpd.nova.edu/hpdresearch].

Any questions regarding the IRB process should be directed to your Center Representative, particularly if you have not yet started the IRB submission process for your study. Also, please contact your Dean to learn if there are any additional guidelines governing research projects in your academic unit. **Please note that no funding will be released for a PFRDG award until all applicable university approvals have been obtained.**

After you have received IRB approval, you may contact your Center Representative or the Office of Grants and Contracts with any questions. **Please note that you must notify the IRB office of any changes to the study before the changes are put into effect. In addition, if you request an extension to the grant next year you must also submit for an extension of IRB approval.**

PROJECT PERIOD AND EXTENSIONS

Funds from the PFRDG account and the appropriate academic units' budgets will be transferred into a restricted account for each award. The accounts will be accessible starting June 1, 2012 and will run until June 30, 2013, or later if an extension of time is granted for completing the project. Requests for extensions beyond June 30, 2013 must be submitted to the VP-RTT at least **60 days before the original project end date** (by April 30, 2013). Extensions may be granted for up to one year, at the discretion of the VP-RTT; extensions beyond June 30, 2014 will not be allowed. Extensions will not confer any additional funds above and beyond the original award amount. A *No-Cost Extension Form* can be downloaded from the PFRDG website [www.nova.edu/PFRDG], and must be submitted to the VP-RTT for approval.

CREATING A BUDGET

It is suggested that the researcher contact the OGC immediately after receiving his/her award notice for assistance in finalizing the proposed budget. The OGC can provide guidance in using the correct budget codes to avoid confusion or problems accessing the award funds during the

budget year. The Income/Expense Codes provided by Financial Operations should be used when preparing the post-award budget [www.nova.edu/cwis/fop/budget/codes.html]. These codes are extremely important and will be used by the OGC to administer the project.

During the course of the award, it may be necessary to spend funds differently than originally budgeted. If so, the principal investigator must complete a *Rebudgeting Request Form*, which is available at the PFRDG website [www.nova.edu/PFRDG]. Variances between budgeted and actual expenses of 25% or less cumulative do not require prior approval from the VP-RTT. In these cases, the *Rebudgeting Request Form* can be submitted to the OGC after the expense has occurred. If the cumulative variance between budgeted and actual expense will exceed 25%, however, the *Rebudgeting Request Form* must be approved by the VP-RTT before the expense occurs.

For example, if there is a \$10,000 award and it becomes necessary to spend \$4,000 on supplies instead of the \$1,000 originally budgeted for that category, that category would be exceeded by \$3,000, which is more than 25% of the \$10,000 award. The principal investigator would need to submit a *Rebudgeting Request Form* to the VP-RTT for approval before incurring expenses for these supplies.

EXPENSES AND PROGRAM INCOME

All requests for expenditures (purchase orders, travel requests, check requests, etc.) must be submitted to the OGC for review for allocability and allowability. All purchase orders and check requests must contain the Principal Investigator/Project Director approval signature. If omitted, the forms will be returned and will delay the payment process. Once approved, the OGC will forward the request to the appropriate department (e.g. check requests to Accounts Payable) for processing.

If any program income is generated during the award period, it must be used for the same purpose as the award. For example, any fees generated from services performed that had been made possible by the award should be used to further the work funded by the award. Most award recipients will not have any program income; principal investigators would work with the OGC to develop a plan to manage the income if it becomes necessary.

The accounts will be accessible starting June 1, 2012 and will run until June 30, 2013 or later if an extension of time is granted for conducting the research. **Please Note: Requests for no-cost project extensions must be submitted to the VP-RTT 60 days before the original project end date. Similarly, all purchase orders must be received by the OGC 60 days before the project end date and NSU must receive all merchandise by the project end date.**

FINAL REPORT

The last part of the formal post-award phase is the completion of a final report. Within **90 days after the project end date** (September 30, 2012) unless a project extension has been granted by the VP-RTT, with a copy to the OGC. The report should include a summary of the sponsored activities. Any papers, abstracts, chapters, etc., which were derived from the research conducted

should also be included. Moreover, if the project leads to the submission of any additional proposals for funding, that information should also be included in the report. If, after submitting the report, new funding is secured or works published, this updated information should be forwarded to the appropriate parties so work that results from these grants can be accurately documented. The information contained in the final report will be documented in the award file and the PFRDG outcomes summary report. This report is published and submitted to the President the following fiscal year.

In the event the researcher is unable to complete the final report within the allotted time frame, a written request for extension must be sent either by email or by a memorandum to the VP-RTT and copied to the OGC. The request should state in detail the circumstances that prevented completion of the written report as well as an anticipated receipt date of the final report. In circumstances where a researcher fails to submit a final report without an approved justification, his/her project will be marked as delinquent and noted as such in the PFRDG outcomes summary report. This information will further be provided to the VP-RTT and President for review during the awarding process of following competition year.

The final report should be double-spaced and written in 12 point font with margin limitation of 1 inch all around. Although there is no page limitation on the written report, the final report should be brief and consist of pertinent information related to the project. The final report should be written within 90 days after the project end date. The report is to be forwarded to the VP-RTT, with a copy to the OGC. Please use the following format as a guide when creating your final report.

I. *Project Title*

II. *Key Personnel* – List the names of the principal investigator, co-principal investigator, and additional team members

III. *Supporters* - List all NSU Academic Units and external entities, if applicable, involved in the Project

IV. *Introduction* – Provide a detailed description of the background and purpose of the project.

V. *Summary of the Project* – Include a detailed summary of the work funded by the PFRDG award, as well as the significant findings or results of the project. This should also include a timeline of the significant award activities.

VI. *Listing of Future Plans* – Describe how the findings will be disseminated to external agencies or organizations. Possible grant submissions, publications and presentations information should be included in this section. Any research or collaboration with outside agencies that was a direct result of the PFRDG should also be included here.

VII. *Publications* – List the titles of publications, presentations, poster presentations, awards or other related activities resulting from the PFRDG.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Please feel free to contact the following individuals for information regarding the PFRDG process:

Dr. Gary S. Margules	Vice President for Research & Technology Transfer	margules@nova.edu (x7507)
Barbara Sterry	Executive Director, Office of Grants and Contracts	sterry@nova.edu (x5365)
Gerry McFarland	Budget (post-award)	gerry@nova.edu (x5250)
Dr. Maryellen Maher*	Quality of Life	maherm@nova.edu (x8554)

*Quality of Life (QOL) Representative

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PFRDG Application

**President's Faculty Research & Development Grant
FY2013 Competition
Application Face Page**

**This form must be completed electronically and is available at
the PFRDG website [www.nova.edu/pfrdg]**

Title of Project (not to exceed 81 characters, including spaces between words and punctuation)

Principal Investigator

Degree Information

Name		
Position Title		
College/School		
Telephone/Fax		
Email Address		

Additional NSU Faculty on Project

Degree Information

Is this person a Co-PI?

Name			<input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO
College/School			
Name			<input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO
College/School			

Additional Faculty & Colleges/Schools

NSU Students/Employees on Project

Degree Information

Is this person a Co-author?

Name			<input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO
College/School			
Name			<input type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO
College/School			

Additional Students/Employees

Is this project a collaboration? YES NO

Are NSU student(s) involved on an author-level in this project? YES NO

List all NSU academic unit(s) involved in this collaboration and the name of the respective dean(s).

Academic Unit		Dean	
Academic Unit		Dean	
Additional Units			

List all **external** agencies involved in this collaboration.

Name		Agency	
Name		Agency	
Additional Collaborators			

Institutional Compliance (Institution Review Board and/or HPD Research Committee)

Does this project involve the use of human subjects? YES NO

Does this project involve the use of animal subjects? YES NO

Discipline: Is this a humanities project? (*Humanities - branches of learning (i.e. philosophy, arts, or languages) that investigate human constructs and concerns as opposed to natural processes and social relations*). YES NO

**President's Faculty Research & Development Grant
 FY2013 Competition
 Title Page**

**This form must be completed electronically and is available at
 the PFRDG website [www.nova.edu/pfrdg]**

Title - Replicating the National Institutes of Health (NIH) guidelines, the title of the project **may not exceed 81 characters**, including the spaces between words and punctuations.

Applicants - Include the names of all full-time faculty or research scientists participating in the project and their respective academic unit (Example: Jane Doe, Ph.D., Farquhar College of Arts and Sciences).

Name

--	--

Academic Unit

--

Additional Faculty

--

Abstract - An abstract or structured summary of the proposed work not to exceed 300 words (single spaced), with emphasis on need/background, rationale, methodological design and material/data analysis, and significance of the study.

**President's Faculty Research & Development Grant
FY2013 Competition
Application**

This form must be completed electronically and is available at the PFRDG website [www.nova.edu/pfrdg]

Narrative - Written proposal narratives must not exceed 10 single space pages (including the form guidelines and headings) of 12 pt font. The narrative must include the following sections:

A. Objectives- Statement of need and importance for the proposed work and the objectives of the project.

B. Methodological Design - Describe the scholarly/experimental design and any preliminary analyses (if applicable).

C. Roles - Role of the principal investigator and others in completing the project. If students are involved in this project, please describe their role. Applicants who include NSU student (s) in author-level participation in their research project will receive five additional points.

D. Feasibility Statement - regarding implementation of the work (the maximum allowable project period is one year from 6/1/12-6/30/13):

1. Time line of activities

2. Work completion date

3. Statement regarding where work will be administratively placed; in what academic unit?

4. Anticipated challenges and resolutions

E. Budget - written statement of the use of funds, including:

1. Summary budget for proposed work (using the table below). The maximum allowable request is \$10,000.

Item Requested	Description (put "NA" if the category does not apply to the project)	Amount Requested
Student Work Study/ Temporary Assistance	<input type="text"/> per hr X <input type="text"/> hrs X 1.079 (7.9% fringe)	\$00,000.00
Consultation		

Equipment (to be university property)		
Research Participant Stipends		
Travel		
Supplies (laboratory, office, classroom, etc.)		
Shipping/Postage		
Other		
Other		
Other		
Total Amount Requested		\$0,000.00

2. Brief budget narrative of how award funds will be used.

F. Evaluation- description of how work is to be evaluated. / How data will be analyzed and interpreted.

G. Dissemination - description of how findings of work will be disseminated to include:

1. What mechanism will be used to disseminate findings (i.e. publications, etc.)?

2. How will the work be externally evaluated for the purpose of dissemination? (i.e. peer review board, panel experts, award committee, etc.)

H. External Funding - discussion of the potential for generation of external funds to maintain activities or develop new projects.

The following sections are not part of the narrative:

References - This section should be limited to bibliographical citations for the resources mentioned in the proposal narrative.

Curriculum Vitae - The principal investigator's CV is required. However, the co-principal investigator(s) may include their CV if desired. **Each CV is limited to 2 pages.**

Word Appendices - This section should be limited to essential information relevant to the proposed project. **Information required in the narrative should not be included in the appendices. Information can only be in text format.**

Picture Appendices - This section should be limited to essential information relevant to the proposed project. **Information required in the narrative should not be included in the appendices. Files can only be uploaded in JPG format and are limited to one page each.**

Picture Appendices 2

Picture Appendices 3

Picture Appendices 4

Picture Appendices 5

**President's Faculty Research and Development Grant
FY2013 Competition
Dean's Commitment Form**

Please submit one complete hard copy of this form. Signatures for NSU students and external collaborators are not necessary.

Dean's Name

Dean's Academic Unit

NSU Faculty's Name(s):

Title of Proposal:

Exact dollar amount of commitment:

Other Support (e.g. facilities, equipment, etc.)
Specifically list the commitment:

Dean's Signature _____

Dean's Name

Dean's Academic Unit

NSU Faculty's Name(s):

Exact dollar amount of commitment:

Other Support (e.g. facilities, equipment, etc.)
Specifically list the commitment:

Dean's Signature _____

Dean's Name

Dean's Academic Unit

NSU Faculty's Name(s):

Exact dollar amount of commitment:

Other Support (e.g. facilities, equipment, etc.)
Specifically list the commitment:

Dean's Signature _____

APPENDIX B

Pre-Screening Proposal Checklist

**President’s Faculty Research & Development Grant
 FY2013 Competition
 Pre-Screening Proposal Checklist**

This form is for informational purposes only and should not be completed by the applicant or returned with the application.

Principal Investigator/Project Director’s Name: _____

Academic Unit: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email Address: _____

Pre-Screener of Project: _____

Date of Review: _____

Is this a collaborative project? Yes No

Are student(s) involved on an author level in the project? Yes No

Checklist Instructions:

The following checklist will be used to pre-screen all applications submitted for funding to the President’s Faculty Research & Development Grant FY2013 competition. All applications not meeting the following basic requirements will be returned to the applicant without further consideration or review.

- The Application Face Page is included and complete.
- All sections of the Title page (title, applicants, abstract) are complete.
- Is this a Humanities project?
- The abstract does not exceed 300 words.
- The proposal narrative is no more than 10 pages, single spaced 12 point font.
- The budget does not exceed \$10,000 and does not include unallowable costs.
- A curriculum vita no longer than 2 pages is included for the principal investigator
- A signed Dean’s Commitment Form is included (only with the hard copy submission)
- A 50% match is indicated on the Dean’s Commitment Form
- The electronic submission was sent via email to PFRDG@nsu.nova.edu as **only one** file in PDF (PFRDG Application)
- The proposal (both electronic and hard copy) was submitted by the March 16, 2012 5:00pm deadline to OGC

APPENDIX C

Reviewer Proposal Rating Forms

**President's Faculty Research & Development Grant
FY2013 Competition
Reviewer Proposal Rating Form**

Instructions for Reviewers

You have received proposals from various academic centers, and it is possible that they are not in your area of expertise. Evaluating proposals from different areas presents a series of challenges. Typically, a wide range of responses will be acceptable, and every proposal will have some merit. Consequently, evaluating diverse proposals demands your close attention to ensure that each is judged by the same standards.

The review and scoring of each proposal should be done individually prior to the panel review session. Please send an electronic copy of your reviewer rating forms for each assigned proposal to PFRDG@nova.edu prior to your panel meeting. Also, please bring a hard copy of each reviewer rating form to your panel meeting. At the panel session, the pre-designated chair will initiate discussion of the proposals merit and scores. Reviewers will have an opportunity to adjust their scores based on the discussion with the panel. The chair will then tabulate a summative score for each proposal and then rank them accordingly. After the session, the chair will be responsible for inputting the final ranking into the PFRDG reviewer form.

We have developed a rating form to help guide you in the evaluation process. Some general guidelines follow:

1. Read the proposals at least once before you start the evaluation process;
2. Do not compare proposals, but evaluate each on its own merit;
3. Evaluate the proposals globally rather than focusing on the proposal's minutiae;
4. Use the standardized assessment form provided below.

Proposals will be submitted electronically to your NSU email account.

The Rating Form will be sent to reviewers to complete during the four-week rating period (3/23/12-4/20/12). All proposals will be rated using the following scores (maximum is score: 110):

- Question 1: Yes = 5; No = 0
- Question 2: Yes = 5; No = 0
- Questions 3-9:
 - Strongly Agree = 10
 - Agree = 8
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree = 6
 - Disagree = 4
 - Strongly Disagree = 2
- Questions 10-15:
 - Strongly Agree = 5
 - Agree = 4
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree = 3
 - Disagree = 2
 - Strongly Disagree = 1

**President's Faculty Research & Development Grant
FY2013 Competition
PFRDG Rating Form**

Reviewer's Name & ID Number

Degree Information

Proposal ID

Title of Evaluated Proposal

1. Is this a collaborative project? YES NO
2. Are NSU student(s) involved at an author level in the project? YES NO

Questions 3-16 are answered on a 5-point Agreement scale with Questions 3-9 weighted double.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3. The proposal establishes an academically worthwhile project with scientific merit.
 10 8 6 4 2
4. The objectives (specific aims) are clearly stated.
 10 8 6 4 2
5. The study design (methods and materials) is scientifically valid.
 10 8 6 4 2
6. The project can be completed as written (technical feasibility).
 10 8 6 4 2
7. The investigators' plan (including collaborators) is specifically designed to achieve the stated objectives.
 10 8 6 4 2
8. The data to be collected will address the research objectives.
 10 8 6 4 2
9. The methods of analyzing data are scientifically suited to the study design and research objectives.
 10 8 6 4 2
10. The budget is justifiable (qualitatively).
 5 4 3 2 1
11. The budget is justifiable (quantitatively).
 5 4 3 2 1

12. The investigators' plan to effectively disseminate the results is valid and reasonable.

- 5
 4
 3
 2
 1

13. The investigator(s) clearly spell out the anticipated results.

- 5
 4
 3
 2
 1

14. Once complete, the project has high potential to lead to external funding.

- 5
 4
 3
 2
 1

15. The expected results or project outcomes have real-world applications for public good.

- 5
 4
 3
 2
 1

Total

Comments Regarding the Proposal:

Comments to the Administration:

Note: Comments written to the administration are only for informational purposes about the PFRDG competition and its processes. These comments will not be seen by the applicant.

1. What would you change about the application or reviewer rating forms?

2. What would you change about the competition and reviewing process?

Additional Comments to the Administration:

**President's Faculty Research & Development Grant
FY2013 Competition
Reviewer Proposal Rating Form: *Humanities Specific*
Instructions for Reviewers**

You have received proposals from various academic centers, and it is possible that they are not in your area of expertise. Evaluating proposals from different areas presents a series of challenges. Typically, a wide range of responses will be acceptable, and every proposal will have some merit. Consequently, evaluating diverse proposals demands your close attention to ensure that each is judged by the same standards.

The review and scoring of each proposal should be done individually prior to the panel review session. Please send an electronic copy of your reviewer rating forms for each assigned proposal to PFRDG@nova.edu prior to your panel meeting. Also, please bring a hard copy of each reviewer rating form to your panel meeting. At the panel session, the pre-designated chair will initiate discussion of the proposals merit and scores. Reviewers will have an opportunity to adjust their scores based on the discussion with the panel. The chair will then tabulate a summative score for each proposal and then rank them accordingly. After the session, the chair will be responsible for inputting the final ranking into the PFRDG reviewer form.

We have developed a rating form to help guide you in the evaluation process. Some general guidelines follow:

1. Read the proposals at least once before you start the evaluation process;
2. Do not compare proposals, but evaluate each on its own merit;
3. Evaluate the proposals globally rather than focusing on the proposal's minutiae;
4. Use the standardized assessment form provided below.

Proposals will be submitted electronically to your NSU email account.

The Rating Form will be sent to reviewers to complete during the four-week rating period (3/23/12-4/20/12). All proposals will be rated using the following scores (maximum is score: 110):

- Question 1: Yes = 5; No = 0
- Question 2: Yes = 5; No = 0
- Questions 3-9:
 - Strongly Agree = 10
 - Agree = 8
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree = 6
 - Disagree = 4
 - Strongly Disagree = 2
- Questions 10-15:
 - Strongly Agree = 5
 - Agree = 4
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree = 3
 - Disagree = 2
 - Strongly Disagree = 1

**President's Faculty Research & Development Grant
FY2013 Competition
PFRDG Rating Form**

Reviewer's Name & ID Number

Degree Information

Proposal ID

Title of Evaluated Proposal

1. Is this a collaborative project? YES NO
2. Are NSU student(s) involved at an author level in the project? YES NO

Questions 3-16 are answered on a 5-point Agreement scale with Questions 3-9 weighted double.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3. The proposal establishes an academically worthwhile project with scholarly merit.
 10 8 6 4 2
4. The objectives (specific aims) are clearly stated.
 10 8 6 4 2
5. The proposed scholarship reflects methods appropriate to the discipline.
 10 8 6 4 2
6. The project can be completed as written (technical feasibility).
 10 8 6 4 2
7. The scholars' plan (including collaborators) is specifically designed to achieve the stated objectives.
 10 8 6 4 2
8. The scholarly materials collected will address the project objectives.
 10 8 6 4 2
9. The proposed methods are suited to the project design and objectives.
 10 8 6 4 2
10. The budget is justifiable (qualitatively).
 5 4 3 2 1
11. The budget is justifiable (quantitatively).
 5 4 3 2 1

12. The scholars' plan to effectively disseminate the scholarly product is valid and reasonable.

- 5
 4
 3
 2
 1

13. The scholar(s) clearly spell out the anticipated product.

- 5
 4
 3
 2
 1

14. The proposal identifies relevant possible sources for future external funding.

- 5
 4
 3
 2
 1

15. The expected results or project outcomes have real-world applications for public good.

- 5
 4
 3
 2
 1

Total

Comments Regarding the Proposal:

Comments to the Administration:

Note: Comments written to the administration are only for informational purposes about the PFRDG competition and its processes. These comments will not be seen by the applicant.

1. What would you change about the application or reviewer rating forms?

2. What would you change about the competition and reviewing process?

Additional Comments to the Administration: