**Clemmer College Summer Research Assignment Review Scoring Criteria**

Name of Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**PRIORITY CRITERIA (max of 10 points) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ total**

\_\_\_ New researchers (4 points) – within 5 years of receiving terminal degree; worked at ETSU for between 1-5 years by the application deadline.

\_\_\_ Research enabling preliminary work to be more competitive for external funds (3 points)

\_\_\_ Experienced researchers needing bridge funds or previous successful track record (2 points)

\_\_\_ Experienced researchers entering new research fields (1 point)

**MERIT CRITERIA** **(max of 24 points) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ total**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Merit Criteria | 2  strong evidence | 1  some evidence | 0 unclear/no evidence |
| 1 | The application is generally understandable to any faculty member. |  |  |  |
| 2 | The description of the research is detailed and permits thorough evaluation. |  |  |  |
| 3 | The research problem is of sufficient importance, significance, and originality. |  |  |  |
| 4 | The problem is not more complex than stated. |  |  |  |
| 5 | The specific aims are measurable. |  |  |  |
| 6 | The project is likely to produce new and useful information. |  |  |  |
| 7 | The methodology is adequate and appropriate to the research. |  |  |  |
| 8 | The overall design of the research or scholarly activity has been carefully thought out. |  |  |  |
| 9 | The investigator appears to be familiar with pertinent literature and methodology. |  |  |  |
| 10 | If a scientific investigation, the proposed research is based on a sound hypothesis that rests on sufficient evidence. |  |  |  |
| 11 | The proposed budget is reasonable and sufficiently justified. |  |  |  |
| 12 | There is a good possibility of external sponsored support. |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Merit Scoring Ranges | | | |
| Poor | Fair | Good | Outstanding |
| 0-6 points | 7-12 points | 13-18 points | 19-24 points |

Funding will be considered first for proposals scoring in the Outstanding range, and then the Good range if funding is available.

**RETURN ON INVESTMENT CRITERIA (max of 6 points)** **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ total**

Return on Investment (ROI) is the potential or likelihood for the scholarly work to generate funding and/or recognition for the investigator, the College, and the University. The investigator should demonstrate for the review committee how the proposed project might position them to seek and successfully obtain one or more of the following:

1. **Financial return**. This proposal could lead to an external grant proposal that will could bring in funding and indirect costs for future research.
2. **Recognition return.** This work would lead to publications directly or prepare publications to get recognition for the researcher, the College, and the University.
3. **Student recruitment return**. The event would assist in recruitment of students who apply and attend ETSU as a result of participation or increased awareness in ETSU and/or Clemmer College programs. (e.g., high school involvement program)
4. **College and University impact return.** Further enhance the impact of the College and University related to significant issues to the East Tennessee region, the state, and/or the national level (e.g., Cindy Chambers postsecondary degree for people with disabilities) – contacts from students interested in project; qualitative feedback from students; filling a void in services for students with disabilities; increasing potential impact of ETSU on the region. Olympic training center example state-wide or nationally.
5. **Others.**

Examples of rationale for ROI

* Current issue in the field/hot topic in field
* Issue that hasn’t been addressed in the field
* Past record of publication or of getting grants
* Doing the proposed study would situate the investigator to propose a larger project to an interested funder
* Data from prior research on impact

1. Low ROI; 6- Very High ROI

**Notes (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, suggestions for improvement):**

**TOTAL SCORE**

Priority Score \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Merit Score \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Return on Investment (ROI) Score \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Total Score ­­­­­­­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**40**