

## 2017 Summer Research Support Guidelines

December 21, 2016

### Overview

The CASA Summer Research Support (SRS) was created in 2013 by the Office of the Dean in the College of Applied Sciences and Arts. The program is designed to (1) increase productivity in research, innovation, and creativity, (2) further develop CASA's unique strengths and opportunities in applied and inter-disciplinary research, and (3) grow and diversify CASA's extramural research funding.

### Eligibility

The Principal Investigator (PI) of the proposal must be a faculty member, either tenured/tenure-track (T/TT) or non-tenure track (NTT), in the College of Applied Sciences and Arts, with a preference given to junior faculty. If funded, the PI will receive a half month salary for summer research. In order to provide research opportunities to as many faculty as possible, recipients of summer funding are asked to not submit the year after their award, but wait until the following year.

### Evaluation & Obligation

1. The proposals are evaluated based on their intellectual merits and broader impact on CASA's vision and mission (<http://asa.siu.edu/about/strategic-plan/strategic-plan-part-one.html>), CASA Strategic Plan (<http://asa.siu.edu/about/strategic-plan/>), and CASA@2020 Initiative (<http://asa.siu.edu/common/documents/CASA-at-2020-Initiative.pdf>). Proposals with the following attributes are highly encouraged:
  - a. Have potential to generate results to secure external funding.
  - b. Have potential to generate result for publication in a top-ranked journal.
  - c. Reflect and help implement CASA strategic goals and actions.
  - d. Integrate research with education.Detailed rubrics are attached at the end of this document.
2. The recipients must submit a report of their research results (two pages minimum) before Monday, August 15, and must present at the next CASA Research Symposium.

### Submission and Review Process

1. The proposal should have the following two parts:
  - a. Part I: The Cover Page – This page should include research project title, principal investigator (PI) name and contact information.
  - b. Part II: The Proposal – The research proposal should have a project title and project description, including how the project will lead to an external grant proposal and help implement CASA's strategic goals and actions, how the project will integrate research and education, and how the results will be published, etc.
2. Please note that the Research Committee is conducting a blind review process, so the cover page (with PI's name and contact information) will be removed by the Dean's office staff before sending it to the Research Committee for review. The second part of a proposal should NOT include any identity information of the PI.
3. Page Limit: Please prepare your proposal to include the following sections within two pages (not including the cover page and references).

**Project Title:** A concise name for the research project.

**Project Description**

It outlines the general plan of work, including the broad design of activities to be undertaken, and, where appropriate, provide a clear description of experimental methods and procedures, and expected outcomes. It must describe as an integral part of the narrative, the prior work, the broader impacts resulting from the proposed activities, addressing one or more of the following as appropriate for the project:

- What will be the expected outcomes of this project?
- How will the results of the project be utilized to seek external funding?
- How will the project integrate research and education by advancing discovery and understanding?
- How does the project support CASA Vision and Mission (<http://asa.siu.edu/about/strategic-plan/strategic-plan-part-one.html>), CASA Strategic Plan (2013) (<http://asa.siu.edu/about/strategic-plan/>), and CASA@2020 Initiative (<http://asa.siu.edu/common/documents/CASA-at-2020-Initiative.pdf>) resulting from the proposed activity?
- What is the timeline of this research?

**References Cited (this part is NOT counted in the 2-page limit)**

Each reference must include the names of all authors (in the same sequence in which they appear in the publication), the article and journal title, book title, volume number, page numbers, and year of publication. If the document is available electronically, the website address also should be identified. APA format.

**Submission Deadline:**

Please submit your proposal electronically via email to [mnemet@siu.edu](mailto:mnemet@siu.edu) by 4:30 p.m. **March 15, 2017.**

**Awarding Date:** The awarding decision will be sent out before April 28, 2017.

**CASA Research Committee (2017)**

Chad Schwartz, Karen Johnson (Co-Chairs), Sean Boyle, Tom Imboden, Seung-Hee Lee, Jose Ruiz, Jennifer Sherry, Marcea Walter, and CASA Associate Dean(s) (Ex Officio).

---

## Summer Research Support Rubric

- A value between 1 (Poor) and 4 (Excellent) will be awarded for each criterion.
- The sum of scores will be added as the final score.

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Rank of PI:  Assistant Professor  Associate Professor  Full Professor

Faculty Category:  Tenure-Track  Tenured  Non-Tenure Track; FTE \_\_\_\_\_%

Criterion	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Excellent (4)
<b>INTELLECTUAL MERIT AND BROADER IMPACT</b>				
The proposal must address one or more of the following:				
<b>External Funding</b>	Not possible to seek external funding based on the result of the research	The research result is minimal for an external funding proposal	The result is good for an external funding support	The result is excellent to be submitted to an external funding source
<b>CASA Strategic Goals/Actions</b>	No connection to CASA strategic goals/actions	Related to, but in indirect fashion	Good connection with foreseeable contribution	Significant contribution to CASA strategic goals/actions
<b>Potential for Publication</b>	Not clear	Defined but not reachable	Good result for conference publication	Excellent result for journal publication
<b>Integrate Research with Education</b>	No impact	Fair impact	Good impact	Excellent impact, perfect integration of teaching with research
<b>RESEARCH PROPOSAL</b>				
<b>Merit and Impact (consider only if items above are ranked 3 or 4)</b>	Proposal addresses one item	Proposal addresses two items	Proposal addresses three items	Proposal addresses four items
<b>Project Description</b>	Project is difficult to understand for people both inside and outside the field of research.	Project is difficult for people outside of the field of research to comprehend	Project is understood by people outside of the field of research with some effort	Project is easy to understand to people both inside and outside of the field of research
<b>Background and Prior Work</b>	Proposal does not present a background or prior work	Background or prior work are partially described	Proposal presents background and prior work, but lacks specific details	Proposal presents the background or prior work
<b>General Plan of Work and Activities</b>	Plan of work or Activities are not described	Activities are poorly described and may not be suitable for the research timeline	Activities may not be clearly described but appears to be suitable for the research timeline	Activities are clearly described and are suitable for the research timeline

<b>Research Timeline</b>	Timeline is not described or is not suitable for the activities described	Timeline meets most of the activities proposed	Timeline appears to be suitable for all the activities described but may not be clearly presented	Timeline is clearly presented and is clearly suitable for the activities described
<b>Methods and Procedures</b>	Provides no discussion of the methods or procedures	Provides only superficial explanation about the methods	Discusses the methods or procedures to be used in the project, but lacks specific details	Discusses the methods or procedures with specific details
<b>Expected Research Outcomes</b>	Proposal does not discuss research outcomes	Provides only superficial explanation about the research outcomes	States results but does not provide specific details	Presents expected research outcomes with specific details
<b>General Writing Mechanics</b>	Poorly written, poor transition sentences, contains major spelling/grammar errors, lacks organization	Fairly written, lacks clarity, difficult to follow, some level of organization, contains some spelling/grammar errors	Well written, almost free of spelling/grammar errors, generally clear, easy to follow	Very well written, free of spelling/grammar errors, clear arguments and well organization
<b>Proposal Guidelines</b>	Not following the guidelines	Partially following the guidelines	Adheres to most of the guidelines	Adheres to all the guidelines

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