



MINI-GRANT PROGRAM TO SUPPORT FACULTY RESEARCH FOR 2018-2019

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Proposal Deadline: September 28, 2018

Submit proposal electronically, with all elements combined into a single PDF file.

Announcement of Awards: October 2018

Program Purpose

This mini-grant program is designed to support the research of School of Science faculty members. In particular, the goal of this program is to *catalyze new projects or research directions*; the program is not designed to provide sustained support. Examples of appropriate use of these funds include:

- Supporting subsequent or concurrent proposals for external funding (large or small); e.g., to support preliminary experiments.
- Providing impetus to a project at a key stage that will lead to submission of a manuscript; e.g., a visit to a collaborator or the purchase of software.
- Supporting a change in research direction or supporting a return to research.

The mini-grant funds could be applied broadly (e.g., for supplies, travel to visit a collaborator, small equipment, student assistant, software, travel to a workshop to learn a new scholarly technique, etc.—but not summer salary for a faculty member). If the amount required for the project exceeds the maximum amount of \$2,000, an awarded mini-grant may be supplemented by department funds at the discretion of the department.

Proposal Requirements and Deadline

Applicants should submit her/his proposal electronically (with all elements combined into a single PDF file) by **4:00 pm, Friday, September 28, 2018** to the School of Science Office at science@tcnj.edu.

Complete mini-grant applications include two elements: 1) a narrative proposal and 2) a recent CV (in any format convenient to the applicant). The narrative proposal must not exceed two pages (single spaced, 1" margins, no smaller than 11 pt font size), and it should briefly explain:

- a) the project and its importance;
- b) the expected outcomes;
- c) what the funds will be used for in a brief budget summary (maximum request: \$2,000); and
- d) why these funds are expected to be critical or particularly helpful in achieving the proposed outcomes to catalyze a new project or research direction.

Eligibility

Full-time faculty members in the School of Science are eligible to apply for a mini-grant.

- Faculty members who have start-up funds remaining are not eligible to apply.
- Past awardees of a School of Science mini-grant are not eligible to apply again for three years following the completion of their award.

Progress Report

A report (up to one page) on the progress made using the mini-grant should be submitted to the School of Science Office by December 1, 2019. The progress report should describe both the predicted and actual outcomes (to date). Any applicant proposing for a second or subsequent mini-grant must include the latest such report with the new proposal.

Proposal Review

A five-member, peer-review committee will evaluate the mini-grant proposals. The review committee will be comprised of School of Science faculty members, with a representative named by each department. To avoid clear conflicts of interest, no member of the evaluation committee will have a pending proposal.

It is the applicant's responsibility to present the proposed project in a clear, well-organized manner that effectively communicates all elements of the proposal to the review committee. Committee members are prohibited from introducing any outside evidence or other information that is not included in the submitted proposals.

Proposals will be reviewed using the following 12-point evaluation rubric:

- 0-3 points for the impact of the entire project on the applicant's research program (proposal).
- 0-3 points for the explanation of why the funds will make a difference to the completion of a grant proposal or manuscript or the initiation of a new or renewed research program (proposal).
- 0-3 points for the discussion of the expected outcomes (proposal).
- 0-3 points for the likelihood that the expected outcomes will be met (CV).

The review committee will rank-order the proposals based on the sum of those points, as translated into a scale where

- 12 = highest priority for funding
- 9 = fund if possible
- 6 = low priority for funding
- 0 = do not fund.