Seed Grants for Transitional and Exploratory Projects (STEP)
Scoring Guide

ORP Pre-Award Compliance Checklist

1st ORP Compliance Check to ensure application is complete and meets requirements:

If either of the first two 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. **Applicants are given 48 hours to correct any items that are indicated as deficient. Failure to resubmit application with all deficiencies corrected within the 48-hour grace period will be excluded from the competition.**

1. All previous Internal Award requirements have not been met at least 5 business days before the program deadline for all PI and Co-I(s). Applicant is ineligible.
2. Applicant is not a full-time faculty member. Applicant is ineligible
3. Applicant has submitted more than one STEP proposal as PI.
4. Project period exceeds one year.
5. Application Packet is not scanned in in the correct order as indicated on the KB app form and/or is incomplete.
6. Narrative exceeds 10 pages (page limit 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. Project Abstract exceeds 150 words.
10. References (Bibliography) and/or CV are not included.
11. All section headings are not included in Narrative.
12. CV exceeds 2 pages

2nd ORP Compliance Check to ensure application is completed:

If returned application is resubmitted with all deficiencies corrected the proposal remains in competition. **If any deficiencies are not corrected the proposal is returned to the applicant indicating the proposal is being removed from the competition with an indication of the deficient item(s) and the failure to meet the 48-hour grace period timeline.**

Seed Grants for Transitional and Exploratory Projects (STEP) Review Committee Scoring Guide

DIRECTIONS: This scoring guide is to be used to facilitate review of all STEP submissions. Detailed comments particularly in the 'Areas of Improvement' section needed to provide feedback to the submitter. This scoring guide addresses critical elements contained in the Guidelines that are available to all applicants. **Ensure your Likert scale rankings and comments align. 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.**

Be aware that research has shown that bias (including unconscious, implicit bias) can affect the review and rating of applicants for awards. As much as possible, check your assumptions when reviewing the applicants' materials. In addition, be aware that there is increasing research showing bias in citations, such as racism being embedded in search algorithms, the propensity to cite people close to your own networks, and interdisciplinary research taking longer to be cited than disciplinary research.

Purpose
STEP provides seed funding on a competitive basis to SIUE faculty and staff to support a project that will be used to seek extramural funding.

The focus of the program is to support promising junior faculty to undertake pilot projects that will aid in establishing their careers as independent investigators and enable them to successfully apply for extramural funding.

Junior faculty prior to midpoint review for tenure and promotion may submit proposals to revise dissertation material. However, applicants must make a strong argument for how the STEP project may propel the applicant's career in a significant and lasting research direction.

STEP funding cannot be used to sustain or supplement current research programs. *Faculty beyond the midpoint review (which includes all ranks associate and above)* who are making a transition to a significantly new research area to support an extramural application may be considered for funding if funds allow. The proposal must clearly demonstrate how the STEP project represents a significant transition in their research from previous activity. Successful proposals by established faculty will outline specific differences between the STEP project and previous scholarly activities, including publications and conference presentations so that an educated lay reader is able to discern the new direction of the proposed project.

Scoring Guide

Proposal Components	Exemplary		Adequate		Needs Improvement		Insufficient	
	8	**7**	**6**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Narrative – Alignment with STEP Goals	• Alignment with STEP program goals is **clear and convincing** • Reviewers have no question that project is appropriate to program		• Alignment with STEP program goals is **clear but less convincing**		• Alignment with STEP program goals is **unclear or not convincing** • Reviewers may question that project		• Section **fails to describe how** proposed project **aligns** with STEP purpose and/or • **Argument is not made** that proposal meets STEP program goals	

Proposal Components	Exemplary		Adequate		Needs Improvement		Insufficient	
					is appropriate to program			
	8	**7**	**6**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Narrative – Procedures & Project Plan	• **Detailed and comprehensive** description of design and methodology is evident • Methodology is **most appropriate** for proposed project • **Detailed, clear** plan for project completion is evident and includes a **timeline** • Required compliance activities are indicated if appropriate		• **Detailed** description of design and methodology is evident • Methodology is **adequate** for proposed project • Plan for project completion is evident but **lacks clarity and/or adequate detail** • Required compliance activities are indicated if appropriate		• Methodology is described but **lacks sufficient detail** • Appropriateness of methodology for proposed project is **unclear** • Plan for project completion is **unclear** • Required compliance activities are indicated if appropriate		• Methodology is **not appropriate** for proposed project • Section is **missing one or more elements** below: *methodology description *appropriateness of methodology related to reflection of project *clear plan for project completion *compliance activities (if appropriate)	

Proposal Components	Exemplary		Adequate		Needs Improvement		Insufficient	
	8	**7**	**6**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Narrative- Timeline	• Scope of work indicated is **appropriate** for a year-long project Timeline does not exceed a year • Timeline encompasses **entire year** • Activities are **described in detail** related to length of time to complete		• Scope of work indicated is **marginally appropriate** for a year- long project • Timeline does not exceed a year • Timeline encompasses **most of the year** • Activities are **described but not in adequate detail** related to length of time to complete		• Scope of work indicated is **minimally appropriate** for a year- long project • Timeline does not exceed a year • Timeline encompasses **half or less of the year** • Activities are described but **missing key details** related to length of time to complete		• Scope of work **exceeds** a year-long project • Timeline **exceeds** a year • Activities are not described	

Proposal Components	Exemplary		Adequate		Needs Improvement		Insufficient	
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Previous Funding Forms and CV	• Documents indicate applicant's **exemplary capacity to produce st**rong outcomes and submit a fundable external proposal		• Documents indicate applicant(s) have **strong** capacity to produce outcomes and submit a fundable external proposal		• Documents indicate applicant has **limited** capacity to produce strong outcomes and submit a fundable external proposal		• Documents indicate applicant(s) is **unlikely** to produce strong outcomes and submit a fundable external proposal	

Proposal Components	Exemplary		Adequate		Needs Improvement		Insufficient	
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Budget Justification	• *All budget line items are allowable* • Each budget line item **clearly** justified *and expenses are clearly related to project* • If requested, time **clearly** matches scope of work • Budget estimates for contractual services and commodities are **well documented** • Travel funds are **only** for data collection purposes • **No external collaborators** are included •		• *All budget line items are allowable* • Each budget line item **adequately** justified *and expenses are clearly related to project* • If requested, time **adequately** matches scope of work • Budget estimates for contractual services and commodities are **adequately** documented • Travel funds are **only** for data collection purposes • **No external collaborators** are included • Guidelines around summer salary and course buyout are **closely followed**		• *All budget line items are allowable* • Each budget line item **marginally** justified *and expenses are clearly related to project* • If requested, time **marginally** matches scope of work • Budget estimates for contractual services and commodities are **marginally** documented • Travel funds are **only** for data collection purposes • **No external collaborators** are included • Guidelines around summer salary and course buyout **have some errors**		• **Weak to no** justification of line items/*items included not related to project/ some line items are not allowable* • If requested, time **does not** match scope of work • Budget estimates for contractual services and commodities are **weakly or not** documented • Travel funds are requested other than for data collection • Line items and budget justification **don't match** • **External collaborators** are included	

Comments:[Please be specific and ensure comments are indicated for all areas and details are provided particularly in Areas of Improvement comments.]

Total Sum of Likert Scale Points	STRENGTHS	AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT

Please indicate your overall opinion of this proposal:

Definitely Award	Possible Award	Do Not Award