

Evaluating Research Grant and Leave Proposals
Qualitative Rating Scale Guidelines
Version 5 – rev. 2008

Completeness All materials received _____ Materials missing _____

Quality

1. **Competence:** the applicant's vita shows relevant competence to carry out the proposed project, or demonstrates the manner in which such competence will be secured from others.
 - **3 points** Applicant has produced similar scholarly works in the past which have been recognized in peer reviewed settings in the related field
 - **2 points** Applicant has produced similar scholarly works in the past but without peer review
 - **1 point** Applicant's vita shows the requisite training to be minimally competent to conduct the proposed work
2. **Originality**
 - **3 points** The proposal introduces something new which will make a significant contribution to the field
 - **2 points** The proposal will make an incremental addition to present knowledge
 - **1 point** It is doubtful that the proposal will make a contribution to the field
3. **Audience**
 - **3 points** Proposed audience includes the element of external review
 - **2 points** Audience lacks external review
 - **1 points** Audience is not clearly identified
4. **Extractable Abstract**
 - **3 points** Abstract includes statement of context, problem statement, description of methods and procedures, and shows potential contribution of proposed project
 - **2 points** Abstract has two or three of the above, but is not complete
 - **1 point** Abstract has one element of the above, but is not complete
5. **Quality and currency of documentation of the existing knowledge or skill base of the discipline.**
 - **3 points** Proposal demonstrates good awareness of the present state of the discipline and how the proposed project will contribute
 - **2 points** Proposal includes elements of elements of 3-point response but lacks clarity and completeness in detail
 - **1 point** The proposal fails to address adequately the current knowledge or skill base of the discipline.
6. **Materials and methods**
 - **3 points** The proposal describes the materials and methods in sufficient detail that a knowledgeable scholar in the discipline should be able to conduct the study
 - **2 points** Materials and methods are generally described, but some details are vague or undecided
 - **1 point** Elements of materials and methods are absent
7. **Supporting materials**
 - **3 points** The proposal makes clear how the proposed project fits into the personal growth plan of the proposer, how it fits into the relevant academic discipline, and how it fits into GFU scholarship standards.
 - **2 points** Some elements of a 3-point response are missing or details are vague or incomplete
 - **1 point** The proposal does not address how the proposed project fits into the personal growth plan of the proposer, how it fits into the relevant academic discipline, and how it fits into GFU scholarship
8. **Schedule and Expenses**
 - **3 points** Schedule seems reasonable given the scope of the project and the other responsibilities of the individual; expenses demonstrate a thoughtful balancing of necessary expenses to complete the proposed project and good stewardship
 - **2 points** Schedule is provided but lacks one or more elements of 3-point response
 - **1 point** Schedule and expenses not present

Final Comment: Any missing material potentially disqualifies a proposal—it implies that the author has not adequately addressed a major area of essential concern regarding the proposed project.