Vaughnie Lindsay New Investigator Award
Scoring Guide

ORP Pre-Award Checklist for completion

If either of the first three statements are true the application is to be returned as ineligible to apply with an explanation. If any of the remaining statements are true the application is to be returned with an explanation and given 24 hours to resubmit.

1st ORP PreAward Compliance Check

1. Applicant is not a tenure-track faculty member at the Asst Prof. level 2. Applicant has previously received the Vaughnie Lindsay Award. 3. All previous Internal Award requirements have not been met. 4. Application Packet is not scanned in in the correct order as indicated on the KB form. 5. Project Summary exceeds 1 page/100 words	6. Narrative exceeds 10 pages (excludes References, Vitae and Appendices) 7. Pages are not numbered 8. Format is not compliant (e.g. 1" margins, 11-point Times New Roman or 10-point Arial font) 9. References or CV are not included 10. CV exceeds 2 pages

2nd ORP Compliance Check (after Chair & Dean letters are attached:

If application reaches this stage and both Chair and Dean letters are not attached an email is sent to the missing letter's author with a cc to the applicant that if the letter is not received within 24 hours then the application will be removed from the competition. Communication needs to indicate that the letter is to be submitted to siueresearch@siue.edu

Review Committee Directions:

This scoring guide is to be used to facilitate review of all Vaughnie Lindsay Award submissions. If you do not award the highest point in any given cell please provide a rationale in the Comments section for that review element. This scoring guide addresses all elements contained in the Guidelines which are available to all applicants. **Numerical scores resulting from the use of this scoring guide can help in final decisions but do not have to be the only deciding factor.**

Vaughnie Lindsay New Investigator Award
Review Committee Scoring Guide

Component	Exemplary (5-6)	Adequate (3-4)	Needs Improvement (1-2)	Insufficient (0)
Evaluation Letters	• Both Chair & Dean letters indicate strong support in **all** areas* • Indicates clear statement of responsibility for 20% cost-share commitment	• Both Chair & Dean letters indicate strong support in **most** areas* • Indicates clear statement of responsibility for 20% cost-share commitment	• Both Chair & Dean letters indicate strong support in a **few** areas* • Indicates clear statement of responsibility for 20% cost-share commitment	• Only one letter indicates strong support or neither letter indicates strong support

*Areas to be included in evaluation letters include:
- o Candidate will make a significant contribution in furthering research or creative activities in respective discipline, applicants scholarly potential and ongoing contribution to department or school and/or SIUE
- o Evidence of professional qualifications to undertake, carry out and complete the planned program of research or creative activities
- o Evidence of significance of the planned activities
- o Likelihood for external funding to continue planned program of research or creative activities
- o Evidence of careful planning of a feasible one-year program of research or creative activities that will make effective use of support offered by a Vaughnie Lindsay Award
- o Commitment to provide 20% cost-share, preferably indicate the budget line items supported (Dean letter only)

Comments:

Component	Exemplary (5-6)	Adequate (3-4)	Needs Improvement (1-2)	Insufficient (0)
Project Summary	• **Entire** summary is **easily** understood by a non-specialist • Provides **concise and descriptive summary** of project • **Clearly indicates** how proposed project fits into applicant's broader research agenda • **Clearly** articulates Problem Statement, Goal and **aligned** Objectives	• **Entire** summary is **generally** understood by a non-specialist • Provides **descriptive summary** of project • **Indicates** how proposed project fits into applicant's broader research agenda • **Articulates** Problem Statement, Goal and **aligned** Objectives	• **Portions of** summary are **difficult** to understand by lay reader • Provides **incomplete** summary of project elements • **Lack of clarity** about how the proposed project fits into applicant's broader research agenda • **Articulates** Problem Statement, Goal **but not all** Objectives are **aligned**	• **Entire or majority of** summary is **difficult** to understand by a lay reader • Summary is missing **OR** appears **unrelated** to project • **Fails to include all** components (project, problem statement, goal(s), objectives, significance, how fits in personal research agenda) in Project Summary

Project Summary Comments:

Component	Exemplary (5-6)	Adequate (3-4)	Needs Improvement (1-2)	Insufficient (0)
Narrative (must also include sub-sections below)	• **All** sections easily understood by a non-specialist • **All** sections are written in a concise and organized manner • **Detailed significance** of the research or creative activities is evident • **Comprehensive and detailed** specific scope of work, goal(s) and objectives of the one-year project are provided • Provides a **comprehensive and detailed** description of how scope of work and objectives of one-year project clearly fits within the applicant's broader research agenda	• **Majority of** sections easily understood by a non-specialist • **Most** sections are written in a concise and organized manner • **Description of the significance** of research or creative activities lacks sufficient details • **More detail** of the specific scope of work and objectives of the two-year project are **needed** • Provides an **adequate** description of how scope of work and objectives of one-year project clearly fits within the applicant's broader research agenda	• **Some** sections easily understood by a non-specialist • **Some** sections are written in a concise and organized manner • **More detail** of the description of how scope of work and objectives of two-year project clearly fit within the applicant's broader research agenda is **needed** • **One of the elements** (i.e. scope of work, objectives, significance of research or creative activities, role Vaughnie Lindsay Award would plan in advancing applicant's research agenda, timeline) is **absent**	• **Few** sections easily understood by a non-specialist • **Few** sections are written in a concise and organized manner • Description of how scope of work and objectives of one-year project clearly fits within the applicant's broader research agenda is **inadequate** • **Two or more elements** (i.e. scope of work, objectives, significance of research or creative activities, role Hoppe Award would plan in advancing applicant's research agenda) are **absent**

Narrative   Comments:

Component	Exemplary (5-6)	Adequate (3-4)	Needs Improvement (1-2)	Insufficient (0)
Narrative – Design and Methodology	- Design and Methodology selected are appropriate for proposed project **Detailed and comprehensive** description of design and methodology is evident - Description of **all** special needs of the methodology are included (e.g. equipment, travel, etc.) **Detailed and comprehensive** timeline for the entire project period, which includes when external funding will be sought, is evident	- Design and Methodology selected are appropriate for proposed project **Detailed** description of design and methodology is evident - Description of **most** special needs of the methodology are included (e.g. equipment, travel, etc.) - Includes timeline for study completion within two years - Detailed timeline which includes when external funding will be sought is evident	- Design and Methodology selected are not appropriate for proposed project - Description of design and methodology are **not detailed** - Description of **some** special needs of the methodology are included (e.g. equipment, travel, etc.) - Includes **incomplete** timetable for study completion within two years (i.e. inclusion of all requisite activities to complete proposed project, failure to include when external funding will be sought)	- Design and Methodology selected are **not appropriate** for proposed project - Description of design and methodology are **entirely inadequate** - Description of **few** special needs of the methodology are included (e.g. equipment, travel, etc.) - Includes **no** timetable for study completion within two years (i.e. inclusion of all requisite activities to complete proposed project, failure to include when external funding will be sought)

Design & Methodology Comments:

Component	Exemplary (5-6)	Adequate (3-4)	Needs Improvement (1-2)	Insufficient (0)
Narrative – Role of Vaughnie Lindsay Award	**Detailed and concise** description of the specific role a Vaughnie Lindsay Award will play in furthering the applicant's research agenda is evident	**Detailed** description of the specific role a Vaughnie Lindsay Award will play in furthering the applicant's research agenda is evident	Description of the specific role a Vaughnie Lindsay Award will play in furthering the applicant's research agenda **needs more detail**	**Fails to address** how a Vaughnie Lindsay Award will further applicant's research agenda OR - Section is missing in its entirety

Role of Vaughnie Lindsay Award Comments:

Component	Exemplary (5-6)	Adequate (3-4)	Needs Improvement (1-2)	Insufficient (0)
Narrative - Timeline	• Comprehensive timeline indicates **all** activities indicated within the project (e.g. personnel retention, purchases, project completion benchmarks) for the total award period	• Comprehensive timeline indicates **most** activities indicated within the project (e.g. personnel retention, purchases, project completion benchmarks) for the total award period	• Comprehensive timeline indicates **few** activities indicated within the project (e.g. personnel retention, purchases, project completion benchmarks) for the total award period	• Section is missing

Timetable Comments:

Component	Exemplary (5-6)	Adequate (3-4)	Needs Improvement (1-2)	Insufficient (0)
Budget and Budget Justification	• Budget is **reasonable** for scope of work • **All** budget items are aligned with the proposed project; no extraneous or unnecessary budget items are included • Budget justification is **detailed and concise** • Budget justification **clearly articulates** items included in the line item	• Budget is **reasonable** for scope of work • **Most** budget items align with proposed project; need for some budget items is unclear • Budget justification is **adequately detailed** • Budget justification **clearly aligns** with line item budget **but may not include all items** for proposed project	• Budget appears **incomplete** to address project needs • Budget justification **does not appear** to align with the line item budget • Budget justification is **missing some details**	• Includes **unnecessary** expenses **or** expenses **unrelated** to project • Budget justification **does not** align with the line item budget • Budget justification is **missing significant details**

Budget & Budget Justification Comments:

Component	Exemplary (5-6)	Adequate (3-4)	Needs Improvement (1-2)	Insufficient (0)
References	• **All** references are current or are seminal research • **All** references related to the proposed project • A **sufficient number** of references are cited • Demonstrates applicant's familiarity with the literature	• **Most** references are current • **Most** references are related to the proposed project • A **sufficient number** of references are cited • Demonstrates applicant's familiarity with the literature	• **Some** references are current • **Extraneous** references unrelated to the project are included • A **sufficient number** of references are cited • Demonstrates applicant's familiarity with the literature	• Majority of citations are **not current** • **Insufficient** references cited • Applicant **does not appear to be familiar** with the literature related to the proposed project
References Comments:				

Component	Exemplary (5-6)	Adequate (3-4)	Needs Improvement (1-2)	Insufficient (0)
Curriculum Vitae	• Document includes **only activities most relevant** to proposed project • Document provides **substantial demonstrated expertise relevant** to proposed project	• Document includes **some** activities relevant to proposed project • Document provides **adequate demonstrated expertise relevant** to proposed project	• Document includes **a few** activities relevant to proposed project • Document provides **minimal demonstrated expertise relevant** to proposed project	• Document **fails to include demonstrated expertise** to conduct proposed project
Curriculum Vitae Comments:				

Component	No points awarded			Minus 6 points
Appendices	• All documents are appropriate for inclusion in Appendices • Documents included are necessary for the reviewers' understanding of the proposed project • Documents included provide evidence of access to needed resources/people	N/A	N/A	• Includes documents with data/information that is more appropriate for the narrative sections
Appendices Comments:				

Additional Points:

+3 - Applicant has completed the midpoint evaluation with a strong research record as indicated by Chair response on application.

+3 – Applicant has received less than $250,000 in external awards while at SIUE as indicated on applicant form.