**Summer Research Grant ($5,000)**

**Selection Committee (2015):**

* School Directors
* Deans

**Eligible**

* Full-time faculty,[[1]](#footnote-1) who
  + either who taught summer school in 2014 or who will teach summer school in 2015

*or*

* + who will supervise an independent study at the undergraduate or graduate level in the summer or 2015, which must be displayed in either the graduate symposium or undergraduate expo the following year (spring 2016).

**Ineligible**

* Past recipients in the last two years, or
* Past recipients in last five years who have not published the research that was the subject of a previous award, or
* Administrative personnel above program director

**Application**

Criteria to be addressed on narrative should demonstrate that the research project is substantially likely to be of quality and impactful. The following rubrics offer more guidance.

Send application via email to Nancy Liddle **on or before** **3/27/2015 at 5 p.m.** At the beginning date of the fall semester the recipients must deliver a 2-page summary of their progress on the project to their respective department head and to the Dean. **Recipients are also expected to participate in the spring 2016 Appalachian Research in Business Symposium.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Traditional Scholarship** | **UNACCEPTABLE**  **(0 point)** | **ACCEPTABLE**  **(1 point)** | **EXEMPLARY**  **(2 points)** | **Points**  **Awarded** |
| **Evidence that the proposed activity is well-conceived.** | *Little or no evidence of a plan for the project* | *Evidence that a plan has been developed for the project* | *Evidence that the project is beyond the conceptualization phase* |  |
| **Evidence that the literature review/project summary provides a clear rationale for the proposed activity.** | *Summary offers little or no rational in the literature/project review in support of the project* | *Summary offers some rational in the literature/project review in support of the project* | *Summary provides clear and sound rational in the literature/project review in support of the project* |  |
| **Evidence that the award will lead to specific advances in the applicant’s discipline.** | *Little or no evidence that the award will lead to specific advances in the applicant’s discipline.* | *Some evidence that the award will lead to specific advances in the applicant’s discipline.* | *Significant evidentiary support that the award will lead to specific advances in the applicant’s discipline.* |  |
| **Evidence that the research methods/procedures & plans for data analysis are clearly stated and appropriate for the proposed activity.** | *Methods/procedures & plans for data analysis are not clearly stated, and/or there is little evidence that the plans are appropriate for the proposed activity.* | *Methods/procedures & plans for data analysis are sufficiently stated, and/or there is some evidence that the plans are appropriate for the proposed activity* | *Methods/procedures & plans for data analysis are clearly articulated and/or there is substantial evidence that the plans are appropriate for the proposed activity* |  |
| **Evidence that the research is substantially likely to be published in a peer-review journal.** | *Little or no evidence that the research is likely to be published in a peer-review journal.* | *Some evidence that the research is likely to be published in a peer-review journal.* | *Substantial evidence that the research is likely to be published in a peer-review journal.* |  |
|  |  |  | *TOTAL POINTS:* |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scholarship of Engagement[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **UNACCEPTABLE**  **(0 point)** | **ACCEPTABLE**  **(1 point)** | **EXEMPLARY**  **(2 points)** | **Points**  **Awarded** |
| **Viable goals and objectives** | *Little or no evidence of a plan for the project* | *Evidence that a plan has been developed for the project* | *Evidence that the project is beyond the conceptualization phase* |  |
| **Best practices in the context of theory and literature** | *Summary offers little or no rational in the literature/project review in support of the project* | *Summary offers some rational in the literature/project review in support of the project* | *Summary provides clear and sound rational in the literature/project review in support of the project* |  |
| **Appropriate research methodology contextually** | *Methods/procedures & plans for data analysis are not clearly stated, and/or there is little evidence that the plans are appropriate for the proposed activity.* | *Methods/procedures & plans for data analysis are sufficiently stated, and/or there is some evidence that the plans are appropriate for the proposed activity* | *Methods/procedures & plans for data analysis are clearly articulated and/or there is substantial evidence that the plans are appropriate for the proposed activity* |  |
| **Results which make a discernable contribution or impact** | *Little or no evidence of a discernable contribution or impact.* | *Some evidence of a discernable contribution or impact.* | *Substantial evidence of a discernable contribution or impact.* |  |
| **Suitable dissemination of findings to the intended audience** | *Little or no evidence of suitable dissemination.* | *Some evidence that the research is likely to be suitably disseminated* | *Substantial evidence that the research is likely to be suitably disseminated.* |  |
| **Reflective critique for guiding future efforts** | *Undeveloped reflective guidance* | *Somewhat developed reflective guidance* | *Substantially developed reflective guidance* |  |
|  |  |  | *Total Points* |  |

1. For fixed term faculty, the grant is conditioned upon continued employment for the subsequent academic year. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. From the criteria developed by the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement, available at

   http://www.unh.edu/outreach-scholars/pdf/review-board-criteria.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-2)