

The University Grants Program

Vision Statement

The University Grants Program supports the vision of Columbus State University by providing funding for faculty activities related to research, scholarship, and professional development. Flexibility and accountability have been written into the University Grants criteria to take into consideration differences in each College's focus, accreditation requirements, and funding priorities.

Competitive University Grants applications are those that commit to one or more specific, tangible products of a **research, scholarship, or professional development** project, including but not limited to:

- An article submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal
- A juried or peer-reviewed performance or exhibition
- A proposal submitted for external funding
- Research project development, data collection, or analysis
- Continuing education that significantly enhances professional development
- A presentation of scholarship at a professional conference

The acquisition of materials and/or equipment may be included in the grant application, but the materials and/or equipment must be directly tied to the development of the tangible product of a research, scholarship, or professional development project. Most often, the tangible outcome should be attained in a one-year period. In the case of multi-year projects, the applicant must identify specific benchmarks to be achieved for each year of the proposed project. At the end of each year, the recipient is required to generate an accountability report indicating the progress of the project.

University Grants are limited to a maximum of \$10,000. For information on previous awards, [click here](#).

All University Grants applications will be reviewed by two committees, one at the college level and one at the university level. The College Review Committees* are established in the belief that the faculty members of the individual colleges are best equipped to evaluate the applications of their colleagues based on the funding and research needs of their Colleges. The College Review Committee vets and prioritizes all of the applications from each College. College Review Committees are made up of one elected representative, with the exception of deans and department chairs, from each department within a College. In case a committee member has submitted an application he/she must be replaced by another faculty member from the same department. The committees must (1) review all applications from their college using the using the University Grants Scoring Rubric (2) evaluate the merit of each proposal, and (3) prioritize the applications recommended for funding using the College Review and Recommendation Form.

All applications and the College Review and Recommendation form are then submitted to the University Grants Committee for review.

The [Faculty Development Committee](#) is made up of (1) two faculty members from each college and one from the library serving two-year terms; (2) one alternate from each college; (3) the director of the Center for International Education and the director of Sponsored Programs as ex officio members. The committee reviews the applications and makes award recommendations to the Provost.

*Faculty organized directly under the Office of the Provost, and faculty reporting directly to the provost rather than a College will submit their applications to the Provost Review Committee comprised of their peers and organized out of the Office of the Provost.

Application and Review Process for Review of University Grants

Process: All faculty members, including non-tenure track, are eligible to apply for funding through this program. All participants should consult the [Academic Affairs Planning Calendar](#) for the due dates for each step in the process.

1. A faculty member completes the University Grants application and submits it to the Department Chair.
2. The Department Chair reviews the applications, adds comments, and passes the applications on to the College Review Committee.
3. The College Review Committee reviews the applications using the University Grants Scoring Rubric. The Committee completes the College Review and Recommendation form including a rank-ordered list of applications, with a brief statement (1-3 sentences) justifying the ranking, for use by the Faculty Development Committee. Note that the College Review Committee recommends the level of funding for each application.
4. The College Review Committee sends all applications and accompanying documentation to the Dean of the College.
5. The Dean reviews the applications, adds comments if necessary, and forwards the applications to the Office of the Provost for review by the Faculty Development Committee.
6. The Faculty Development Committee reviews the applications and makes award recommendations to the Provost.
7. The Provost's office makes the final decision and administers the awards.
8. Successful grant recipients must file a University Grants Accountability Report with the Provost's office no later than 60 days after the target completion date of their project. The recipient also sends copies of the report to their chair and dean. Failing to submit accountability reports for most recent completed university grant may result in denying the applicant's current application.

University Grants Scoring Rubric

Category and Scoring	Score	Description
Accountability Report	_Yes _No _N/A	Failing to submit accountability reports for most recent completed university grant may result in denying the applicant's current application.
Overview (0-10 points)		Provides a one-paragraph overview of the project. Demonstrates how the project results in one or more specific, tangible products of a research, scholarship, or professional development project.
Specific final product (0-10 points)		Demonstrates that the intended final product is tangible and of high quality, as recognized by the standards of the discipline.
Professional development/mission (0-20 points)		Demonstrates how the project advances the applicant's professional development and contributes to the mission and appropriate goals of the department, college, and/or university.
Methods/Procedures (0-10 points)		Describes the project's method or process clearly and provides detailed description that supports the requested expenditure of funds.
Feasibility/Timeline (0-10 points)		Demonstrates the project has a feasible path to completion by a target date within one year of the award. Explains how the funds requested will be used during the project timeline.
Budget (0-15 points)		Includes a detailed budget that is cost effective. Provides documentation of quotes. If quotes are not available, estimates are provided. All budget items are justified.
Merit (0-25 points)		Provided sound argument and justification for a project of significant value.
Total Score (0-100)		
Reviewer's Comments		