

Faculty Professional Development Council (FPDC) Grants Council Member Review Form (rev 6.12.18)

PASSHE PROPOSAL #: _____
 INVESTIGATOR(S) NAME(S): _____
 NAME OF UNIVERSITY: _____
 REVIEWER'S NAME: _____

DATE: _____

Please refer to the rubric & guide for interpretation of the review criteria. A Proposal **MUST** score a minimum of 3 on every criterion.

Is the proposal in the Correct **CATEGORY**? A subcommittee majority makes this determination Yes _____ No _____

Review Criteria	Please Mark (X) <i>only one number</i> or score for each criterion					Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	Poor		Exemplary					
PROJECT OBJECTIVES & OUTCOMES (Factor 1)	1	2	3	4	5		X3	
	Poor		Exemplary					
PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE &/or CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD (Factor 2)	1	2	3	4	5		X1	
	Poor		Exemplary					
STUDENT SUCCESS (Factor 3)	1	2	3	4	5		X3	
	Poor		Exemplary					
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Factor 4)	1	2	3	4	5		X5	
	Poor		Exemplary					
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY/CREATIVE PROCESS (Factor 5)	1	2	3	4	5		X3	
	Poor		Exemplary					
BUDGET (Factor 6)	1	2	3	4	5		X1	
Probationary Faculty _____ Yes _____ No								
TOTAL SCORE (possible Maximum Weighted Score is 80)								

IRB/IACUC Requirements (Please Check): Approved Pending Missing Not Applicable

Comments: _____

GUIDE TO THE FPDC REVIEW FORM & RUBRIC

Components of the Review Form

The FPDC Review Form is comprised of the following pieces of information: a) PASSHE-assigned Proposal Number; b) Investigator(s) Name(s); c) Investigator(s) Institution(s); d) Reviewer's Initials; e) Date of Review of Proposal; f) Six Review Criteria or Factors; g) Five-point Evaluation Scale with Operational Definitions of each Review Criteria; h) Institutional Review Board (IRB) Need, and i) Open-ended Review Comments.

Pre-screen. Is the Proposal in the correct category? The majority of members of the FPDC sub-committee must agree that the proposal is in the correct category. However, some distinctions between categories are subjective (e.g. joint faculty-student projects) and a close reading and a careful discussion of the proposal is necessary to make an informed judgment. If the majority of the Council Subcommittee believes the proposal is NOT in the correct category, it should be disqualified without finalizing a score. NO POINTS or weight are awarded for this criterion.

Review Criteria. All complete FPDC grant applications will be evaluated using the following six criteria:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Objectives & Outcomes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Development |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Significance &/or Contribution to the Field | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Research Methodology |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student Outcomes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget |

Operational Definitions of each Review Criterion or Factor are explained on the RUBRIC FOR FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (FPDC) GRANTS with a Five-point Evaluation Scale. Each of the six review criteria in the complete FPDC grant proposal is evaluated based on a five-point scale; with 1 indicating Poor and 5 indicating Exemplary.

Interpreting the Rubric.

Before using the FPDC Rubric to score each applicant's proposal, the reviewer should become very familiar with its contents. In employing the FPDC Rubric to evaluate each proposal, it's strongly recommended to start from the **bottom of the instrument** (equivalent to a rating of one) **and proceed** upwards (until a maximum possible rating of five). Faculty applicant must demonstrate that the statements identified within each level of each Review Criterion are all applicable or not applicable before proceeding upwards to the next scale or level. For example, if an applicant has met all the indicators or statements identified at level 1 for "Project Objectives & Outcomes", then the Reviewer should proceed to the level 2 to determine if he/she has met all indicators, and so on. If an applicant has met all indicators in levels 1, 2, 3, 4, but not 5, then he/she should receive a maximum score of 4 for that particular Review Criterion. Prospective and successful investigators, in achieving a maximum score of 5, must fulfill ALL of the performance indicators or operational definitions contained within each of the Review Criteria or Factors. A Proposal must receive a minimum score of 3 on every Criterion in order to be considered eligible for funding.

Multiply the score of 1 to 5 by the weight to arrive at the weighted score for each factor. Total Score is the sum of the weighted score column. Add 5 points if the Project Director is probationary faculty (see proposal title page). The total possible or maximum score that an applicant can receive, after weighting, is 80.