

Clayton State University Academic Affairs
Faculty Research Grant Proposal Guide

I. Project Abstract

*Is the abstract written in a clear way that describes a well-structured, logical project?
Does it plainly illustrate why it should be funded?
Does it explicitly relate how the project will contribute to the discipline?*

II. Project Description

Specific Aims/Objectives

*Are the Specific Aims and Objective clearly stated?
Are they stated as SMART; specific, measurable, attainable, reasonable, and time limited?*

Theoretical Framework

*Does this section synthesize recent literature in the discipline?
Does it demonstrate knowledge of issues involved and provide conceptual framework for project?*

Research Methodology

*Will the research plan answer the research questions and are they appropriate?
Is it clear what kind of data will be collected and how it will be collected/analyzed?*

Impact of Project

*Will the research advance the discipline?
Will it add to the faculty's PD and enhance department course(s)?
Does the opportunity relate to one of the [University's strategic planning goals](#)?*

Dissemination of Results

*Is the dissemination plan clear and doable?
Has how and where the results will be disseminated to internal and external interested parties been identified?*

III. Project Timeframe

Timeline of Activities

*Provides a clear and logical timeline of proposed project activities from start to finish?
Is the format of timeline an annotated list of dates and activities?*

IV. Requested Budget (and Other Funding, applicable)

*Is the budget itemized and does it include only allowable costs and is it <\$2,500?
Does the budget directly support the project activities and is fully justified?_*

Other Project Funding

*Have you applied for or have you received funding for this project from any other source(s)? If yes, please give details (when, source of funding, amount of funding, etc.).
Is current or past funding information provided, if applicable?*

Clayton State University Academic Affairs

Faculty Research Grant Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Applicant: _____

Reviewer: _____

Department: _____

Date: _____

Evaluation Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Abstract	Clearly presents a well-structured, logical project and explicitly explains how the research project contributes to the discipline.	Project is clearly described and contribution is evident.	Project description or contribution lacks clarity.	Abstract is unclear, incomplete, or poorly organized.	____/4
Specific Aims & Objectives	Aims and objectives are clearly stated, focused, and aligned with project goals.	Most objectives are clear and reasonably aligned.	Objectives are somewhat unclear or lack focus.	Objectives are vague, missing, or poorly aligned.	____/4
SMART Objectives	Objectives are specific, measurable, attainable, reasonable, and time-limited.	Most SMART elements are present.	Some SMART elements are evident.	SMART framework is largely absent.	____/4
Theoretical Framework & Literature Review	Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of relevant literature, synthesizes current scholarship, and provides a strong conceptual framework.	Literature review is adequate and supports the project.	Limited synthesis or conceptual grounding.	Minimal literature review or conceptual framework.	____/4
Research Methodology	Research design is rigorous, appropriate, and clearly explains data collection and analysis methods.	Research methods are appropriate and generally well described.	Methods lack sufficient detail or alignment with objectives.	Methods are unclear, inappropriate, or incomplete.	____/4
Impact on Discipline	Research has strong potential to advance scholarship and contribute significantly to the discipline.	Research contributes meaningfully to the discipline.	Contribution to the discipline is limited.	Impact is unclear or unsupported.	____/4
Faculty & Departmental Impact	Clearly enhances faculty professional development, scholarship, and departmental curriculum or courses.	Benefits to faculty and department are evident.	Benefits are mentioned but not fully developed.	Little evidence of impact on faculty or department.	____/4
Alignment with University Strategic Goals	Strong and explicit alignment with one or more university strategic planning goals.	Alignment is apparent and adequately explained.	Alignment is weak or minimally discussed.	No clear connection to strategic goals.	____/4
Dissemination Plan	Clear, realistic dissemination plan with identified internal and external audiences and venues.	Dissemination plan is adequate and feasible.	Dissemination plan lacks detail or specificity.	Dissemination strategy is absent or unrealistic.	____/4
Project Timeline	Provides a detailed, logical, annotated timeline with clear milestones from start to completion.	Timeline is clear and feasible.	Timeline lacks sufficient detail or organization.	Timeline is missing, incomplete, or unrealistic.	____/4
Budget	Budget is clearly itemized, contains only allowable expenses, is fully justified, and complies with funding limits.	Budget is itemized, contains only allowable expenses, is sufficiently justified, and complies with funding limits.	Budget requires clarification, itemization, and/or stronger justification.	Budget exceeds guidelines, includes unallowable costs, or lacks justification.	____/4
Other Project Funding	Clearly identifies current, pending, or past funding sources and fully documents funding history.	Funding information is adequately provided.	Funding information is incomplete.	Funding disclosure requirements are not addressed.	____/4

Scoring Summary

Total Points Earned: _____ / 48

Total Score	Recommendation
44–48	Highly Recommend Funding
38–43	Recommend Funding
30–37	Recommend Funding with Reservations
0–29	Do Not Recommend Funding

Reviewer Comments

Proposal Strengths

Areas for Improvement

Final Recommendation

- ☐ Highly Recommend Funding
- ☐ Recommend Funding
- ☐ Recommend Funding with Reservations
- ☐ Do Not Recommend Funding