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**Background**

Discussions with the Committee on Faculty Affairs have alerted Steering to the fact that there is no single current document describing the purpose, principles and procedures guiding the SOSA program. There are approximations to such a document including the original proposal that created the SOSA program in 2000,which is described as “…a transitional, short-term model that will be implemented until long-term systematic changes are made with respect to faculty course load.” Additionally, the SOSA process was reviewed in 2005 and 2008 when major changes with respect to the types of available awards were made. The original proposal and the results of the 2008 review are available at <http://www.tcnj.edu/~academic/research/index.html>. Instead of relying on a central defining document that reflected community input and approval through governance, the purposes and processes governing the SOSA program were outlined in a changing succession of RFPs.

**Charge**

The Steering Committee charges the Committee on Faculty Affairs to develop a SOSA document that:

1. describes the enduring principles which define the purposes and mission of the SOSA program;
2. describes the principles guiding the various factors by which proposals are to be judged; and
3. describes the principles defining which types of projects are eligible to receive support.

Such a document should provide a basis from which future RFPs can be drafted each year. In addition, the resulting SOSA document and its implementation will be the subject of future reviews.

Additionally, we note that CFA is currently charged with determining a process by which the SOSA committee reviews applications from its membership. A recommendation concerning this more narrow charge can be folded in to a preliminary recommendation meeting this broader charge. However, in case CFA cannot complete the broader charge in time for the next SOSA cycle, CFA is asked to complete its work on the more narrow charge in time for that cycle. Similarly, CFA might need to create the RFP for the next SOSA cycle before it has a chance to finish its work on this charge. In that case, CFA is asked to create the RFP in such a way that it does not represent a change of principles from recent RFPs.

In its deliberation, Steering asks CFA to consider the membership of SOSA. If CFA feels that changes in committee make-up are appropriate, CFA is asked to give such a suggestion to the Steering Committee, which will consider it as input to the ongoing review of governance.

Lastly, we note that the testimony that CFA receives to create a preliminary recommendation should include any input from recent chairs and members of the SOSA committee. Of course, broad community input must inform the development of any final recommendation, and we note that a survey of faculty provided useful information at the time of the last SOSA review.

**Development of the Recommendation and Gathering of Testimony**

In May 2011, CFA sent a Final Recommendation to Steering. That recommendation considered input from past SOSA Chairs; from Candice Feiring, the Provost's representative to the SOSA Committee; and from Dr. Janet Morrison, Chair of the MUSE Program. As well, testimony was gathered at two Open Fora (April 20, 2011 and April 21, 2011), through email, and from a Qualtrics Survey (145 respondents representing 44% of the faculty). Citing insufficient campus input, The Steering Committee returned the May 2011 Final Recommendation to CFA.

CFA revised its previous recommendations and developed a new Preliminary Recommendation based on the testimony solicited in the previous spring semester, which was then sent to the campus community.  Testimony was again gathered through consultation with the Chair of SOSA, Open Fora (October 19, 2011 and November 1, 2011), email, and a Qualtrics Survey. One hundred and eleven faculty members accessed or began the survey, 58 faculty members completed it.  Of those who completed it, 14 objected to the proposal.  The others had some concerns but overall approved the proposal (17) or registered approval without concerns (27).  Low response to the Qualtrics survey may have been due to the fact that faculty felt that they had already responded to these questions in the spring semester, when response to the survey was much greater.

The January 2012 Final Recommendation reflects CFA's effort to ensure that the SOSA process is transparent and fair to faculty and librarians at every rank and stage of their respective careers.

**Final Recommendations**

CFA is making five final recommendations about the SOSA Program.  Four of the recommendations are represented by the SOSA documents.  These include:

* 1. A “Purpose, Principles, and Procedures” statement
	2. An updated “Request for Proposals” (RFP) for use in the next SOSA cycle
	3. A post-award reporting requirement
	4. A weighted evaluation rubric for ranking of SOSA proposals

The fifth recommendation that CFA makes relates to sustaining the transparency of the SOSA Awards by requesting that the Office of Academic Affairs annually post information regarding SOSA Awards:

* 1. CFA recommends that Academic Affairs post the demographics of the faculty/librarian awards by the awardees' rank, tenured/pre-tenure status, and School.

**Support of Scholarly Activities (SOSA)**

**Purpose, Principles, and Procedures**

**Program Mission and Enduring Principles**

The Support of Scholarly Activities (SOSA) program is designed to support faculty and librarian scholarship, creative activity, and professional activity with exceptional merit and/or promise.  The SOSA program reflects the College’s commitment to making TCNJ a strong community of teacher-scholars and librarian-scholars. The program provides tenure stream faculty members and librarians an alternate assignment within workload in order to have more time to engage in their scholarly, creative, or professional activities. SOSA awards may also be used for faculty and librarian scholarly, creative, or professional work, which engages students as collaborators or apprentices. The SOSA program is designed to support two equally important groups, both a) new faculty members and librarians in establishing their agenda for scholarship, creative, or professional activity, and b) continuing faculty members and librarians in engaging in scholarship, creative, or professional activity.

The SOSA program is a competitive yet inclusive grant program as it provides faculty members and librarians with re-assigned time to expand their program of scholarly, creative, or professional activity beyond the level that is already expected and included within workload. Successful proposals must be high quality and innovative and supported by the candidate’s area of expertise, track record, and academic goals. Given that SOSA alternate assignment is possible only with budgetary resources, SOSA grants are awarded in accordance with the following enduring principles:

1. The SOSA program is a competitive process that supports prospective scholarly, creative, or professional work.  The review process is conducted in a fair, transparent, and efficient manner.

1. The intellectual merit of the proposed scholarly, creative, and/or professional program/project for SOSA alternate assignment is given the greatest weight in the evaluation of any SOSA proposal.

1. The scholarly, creative, and/or professional qualifications of the applicant are also given consideration in the review process.  The applicant’s area of expertise, track record, and academic goals should support the proposed SOSA work and enhance the scholarly culture at the College.

1. The review process takes into consideration the broader impacts on both the applicant’s scholarly, creative, or professional program and the overall teacher-scholar and librarian-scholar culture at TCNJ.

All full-time, tenure-line faculty members and librarians, regardless of tenure status or rank, are eligible and encouraged to apply for SOSA awards.  The teaching or administrative needs of any Program, Department, or School cannot be used to discourage any applicant from applying.

**Distribution and Duration of Awards**

Awards are distributed competitively according to a procedure recommended by the Committee on Faculty Affairs (CFA) and approved through the governance process in consultation with the Union.  A campus-wide SOSA Committee, made up of appointed members of the faculty, evaluates applications.

A total of 96 awards, of three faculty-weighted-hours each, are distributed each academic year.  This total includes the number of awards that are ongoing from the previous year. The SOSA program uses a system of two-year awards for all successful applicants. Approximately half of the 96 SOSA slots are awarded each year. A small number of one-year awards may also become available as a result of recipients relinquishing one year of a two-year award. All applicants are assumed to be applying for a two-year award; they need not indicate in the proposal that they are seeking a two-year award.

**Conditions for Alternate Assignment in SOSA**

The following conditions apply to all faculty members receiving SOSA awards:

* 1. Recipients of SOSA alternate assignments may not accept overload course assignments during the same academic year that she/he holds the award.  Overload that does not add-up to a course, such as 0.2 or 0.5 faculty-weighted-hours (FWH), is permitted.  Overloads totaling more than 3 FWH during a SOSA year require Provost’s approval.

* 1. Faculty members and librarians who apply for both a sabbatical and a SOSA award at the same time must choose to accept one or the other if both are awarded.  Those who choose a sabbatical forfeit the SOSA award for the sabbatical year.  Applicants may not receive both sabbatical leave (whole- or half-year) and a SOSA award during the same academic year.  If a faculty member or librarian decides to take a sabbatical (whole- or half-year) during one year of a two-year SOSA award, the SOSA award is forfeited for that year.

* 1. Applicants who apply unsuccessfully for a SOSA award in one year may reapply in subsequent years.

* 1. SOSA awards may not be used to reduce any full-time faculty member’s teaching load below one course unit per academic year.

* 1. Faculty members or librarians who are denied reappointment or tenure forfeit any SOSA award for the final year of employment.

**Types of Eligible Scholarly/Creative/Professional Activities**

The following types of scholarly/creative/professional activities are eligible to be supported by the SOSA program:

1.  **Research**

   Any of the following categories of research are eligible for support as long as they are to be communicated to the academic community beyond TCNJ.  Eligible venues for communicating research include a broad range commensurate with practices among the many disciplinary and inter-disciplinary fields in which TCNJ teacher-scholars conduct their work.  The most common include: articles in professional journals; published books, editions, textbooks, and chapters; original papers for conferences or professional societies; lecture recitals; service as editor or reviewer of scholarly works or proposals; proceedings of conferences, panels, or meetings; published manuals or handbooks to accompany texts, instruments, or equipment; software; and electronic media.

a. *The Scholarship of Discovery* – The traditional research model in which new content knowledge is acquired.

b. *The Scholarship of Integration* – The creation of new knowledge by synthesizing and making connections across disciplines or sub-disciplines.

c. *The Scholarship of Application* – The bridging of the gap between theory and practice through both research and action.

d. *The Scholarship of Pedagogy* – The discovery or evaluative analysis of the ways students learn, and the identification and assessment of methods used to foster learning.

2.  **Creative Endeavors**

   These include original works of art, creative writing, drama, documentary, music, dance, graphic design, digital arts, and architecture.  These creative outcomes are presented to the public through performances, shows, original compositions, sound or visual recordings, publications, displays or exhibits.  Activities may include participation on panels, in discussion groups, seminars, or workshops, or curating exhibitions.

3.  **Professional Activity**

   Professional activities as a consultant or practitioner are considered scholarly activity when they involve the creation, rather than the application, of knowledge and impact significantly on one’s discipline.  These activities demonstrate professional recognition of one’s scholarship at least at the local level and may include such work as original research when consulting for an outside organization, creating national standards for an accrediting organization, designing curricula for national or regional use, etc.  Documentation of professional activities may include written evaluations by peers or professional organizations.

4.  **Major Grant Application Preparation**

   Preparation of applications for highly competitive, major grants (in support of scholarly, creative, or professional activities as described above) requiring extensive advance research and documentation.

**Institutional Review Board (IRB) and**

**Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) Approval**

Faculty members who are planning research involving either human subjects or vertebrate animals must obtain approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) or the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), respectively.

•  TCNJ’s policies and procedures for IRB approval can be found at: <http://www.tcnj.edu/~irb/>.

•  TCNJ’s policies and procedures for IACUC approval can be found at:

      <http://grants.intrasun.tcnj.edu/compliance/animal.html>.

**Proposal Evaluation**

   **1.  Review Process**

Submitted proposals will be reviewed and evaluated by an interdisciplinary SOSA Committee.  After a norming process to standardize approaches to scoring, committee members will split into two panels to evaluate proposals using the review criteria listed below.  The full Committee will consist of 11 members, with representatives from the following units:

* + One person from each of the following schools: Arts and Communication, Business, Education, Engineering, Nursing and HES (total of 5)
	+ Two people from the School of Humanities and Social Sciences (one from Humanities, one from Social Sciences)
	+ Two people from the School of Science (one from Math/Computer Science, one from Biology/Chemistry/Physics)
	+ One person from the Library
	+ One designee from the Provost (ex officio, non-voting)

Each panel will consist of 6 people, with the Provost’s Designee sitting on both. The composition of each panel will be determined by the full SOSA Committee itself as it organizes for work each year.  Each panel will elect its own chair, who does not necessarily have to be the same person as the chair of the full SOSA Committee.

In order to avoid bias, when proposals are discussed and reviewed by panels and the full SOSA Committee, individual committee members must not introduce any outside evidence or other information that is not included in the submitted proposals.  Moreover, individual committee members must not advocate for any of the submitted proposals.  This is particularly important for proposals from the same discipline or general area of the SOSA Committee members.

In order to avoid bias for proposals submitted by SOSA Committee members, these proposals will be directed to and reviewed by the panel on which the Committee member does not serve, so that no one reviews his/her own proposal.

**2.  Review Procedures**

      The SOSA Committee will follow the major steps listed below in its review of proposals.

* 1. The full Committee will initially engage in a proposal norming step.  The full Committee will first discuss how to use and apply the evaluation rubric.  The full Committee will then review several example proposals, with each individual Committee member independently reviewing each example proposal using the evaluation rubric to assign scores.  The Chair will then compile the scores, and the full Committee will discuss the proposals, the range of scores, and the use of the rubric.  This norming step is designed to standardize approaches to scoring, establish consistency in scoring between and among reviewers, and ensure a fair and transparent evaluation process.

* 1. The full Committee will divide into two panels, with each panel reviewing approximately half of the proposals.  Individual panel members will assign preliminary scores to each proposal using the evaluation rubric.  Each panel chair will compile a summary spreadsheet of the preliminary scores, and each panel will meet to review and discuss the proposals.  Any panel member can nominate any proposal for discussion by the panel. As a result of the discussions, panel members may choose to revise their preliminary scores.

* 1. Each panel will then submit their scores to the SOSA Chair, who will compile a summary spreadsheet and submit all preliminary scores to the full Committee.  The scores for the proposals that were submitted by SOSA committee members will be sent to the Provost’s Designee rather than to the SOSA Chair.

* 1. The full Committee will re-convene for a comprehensive review of all preliminary scores, and then it will develop final scores.  Upon review of all of the preliminary scores, individual SOSA Committee members can nominate any proposal for review and discussion by the full Committee.  The full Committee does not have to review and discuss every proposal.

* 1. Upon completion of the full Committee’s determination of final scores, the SOSA Chair will provide the final scores to the Provost’s Designee.  The Provost’s Designee will integrate the scores from any individual SOSA Committee members who had submitted proposals.  The Provost’s Designee will then submit the complete summary of final scores to the Office of Academic Affairs.

* 1. After the SOSA results are announced, the Chair of the SOSA Committee can share the average scores of each category in the evaluation rubric with applicants who request feedback.

      **3. Review Criteria**

The applicant should keep in mind that non-specialists will be evaluating her/his proposal, so the applicant should be certain to use non-technical language that is accessible to any educated lay person. It is the applicant’s responsibility to present the proposal in a clear, well-organized, and coherent manner that effectively communicates the proposed work and its merits. SOSA Committee members will evaluate each proposal on the basis of its intellectual merit and the qualifications/expertise of the applicant.  The evaluation rubric that will be used by the SOSA Committee can be found on the last page of the Request for Proposals.

**Post-award Reporting Requirements**

Every supported faculty member and librarian must submit a final report of scholarly/creative/professional activities at the end of the grant period, to be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs on the first Monday of October. Reports will be used in the evaluation of subsequent applications.  Failure to submit a report will place future workload assignments for scholarship in jeopardy.

The report should include a brief description of 1) the nature of the scholarly/creative/professional activities carried out during the SOSA award, 2) the objectives and expected outcomes from the original, funded SOSA proposal, and 3) a short explanation of how they were met or why they were not met.  Instructions for the format of the *Alternate Assignments Follow-up Report* are available online:

http://www.tcnj.edu/~academic/research/index.html.

Interim reports at the end of the first year of a two-year award are not necessary.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | **Support of Scholarly Activities (SOSA)****for Awards in Academic Years 2013-2015** |

**Request for Proposals**

**Proposal Deadline:**

Submit 12 copies of the complete application to the Office of Academic Affairs (Green Hall 212)

**Announcement of Awards:  Mid-January**

**Program Mission and Enduring Principles**

The Support of Scholarly Activities (SOSA) program is designed to support faculty and librarian scholarship, creative activity, and professional activity with exceptional merit and/or promise.  The SOSA program reflects the College’s commitment to making TCNJ a strong community of teacher-scholars and librarian-scholars. The program provides faculty members and librarians an alternate assignment within workload in order to have more time to engage in their scholarly, creative, or professional activities. SOSA awards may also be used for faculty and librarian scholarly, creative, or professional work, which engages students as collaborators or apprentices. The SOSA program is designed to support two equally important groups, including both a) new faculty members and librarians in establishing their agenda for scholarship, creative, or professional activity, and b) continuing faculty members and librarians in engaging in scholarship, creative, or professional activity.

The SOSA program is a competitive yet inclusive grant program as it provides faculty members and librarians with re-assigned time to expand their program of scholarly, creative, or professional activity beyond the level that is already expected and included within workload. Successful proposals must be high quality and innovative and supported by the candidate’s area of expertise, track record, and academic goals. Given that SOSA alternate assignment is possible only with budgetary resources, SOSA grants are awarded in accordance with the following enduring principles:

1. The SOSA program is a competitive process that supports prospective scholarly, creative, or professional work.  The review process is conducted in a fair, transparent, and efficient manner.

1. The assessment of the proposed scholarly, creative, and/or professional program/project for SOSA alternate assignment is given the greatest weight in the evaluation of any SOSA proposal.

1. The scholarly, creative, and/or professional qualifications of the applicant are also given consideration in the review process.  The applicant’s area of expertise, track record, and academic goals should support the proposed SOSA work and enhance the scholarly culture at the College.

1. The review process takes into consideration the broader impacts on both the applicant’s scholarly, creative, or professional program and the overall teacher-scholar and librarian-scholar culture at TCNJ.

All full-time, tenure-line faculty members and librarians, regardless of tenure status or rank, are eligible and encouraged to apply for SOSA awards.  The teaching or administrative needs of any Program, Department, or School cannot be used to discourage any applicant from applying.

**Distribution and Duration of Awards**

Awards are distributed competitively according to a procedure recommended by the Committee on Faculty Affairs (CFA) and approved through the governance process in consultation with the Union.  A campus-wide SOSA Committee, made up of appointed members of the faculty, evaluates applications.

A total of 96 awards, of three faculty-weighted-hours each, are distributed each academic year.  This total includes the number of awards that are ongoing from the previous year. The SOSA program now uses a system of two-year awards for all successful applicants. Approximately half of the 96 SOSA slots are awarded each year. A small number of one-year awards may also become available as a result of recipients relinquishing one year of a two-year award. All applicants are assumed to be applying for a two-year award; they need not indicate in the proposal that they are seeking a two-year award.

**Conditions for Alternate Assignment in SOSA**

The following conditions apply to all faculty members receiving SOSA awards:

1. Recipients of SOSA alternate assignments may not accept overload course assignments during the same academic year that she/he holds the award.  Overload that does not add-up to a course, such as 0.2 or 0.5 faculty-weighted-hours (FWH), is permitted.  Overloads totaling more than 3 FWH during a SOSA year require Provost’s approval.

1. Faculty members and librarians who apply for both a sabbatical and a SOSA award at the same time must choose to accept one or the other if both are awarded.  Those who choose a sabbatical forfeit the SOSA award for the sabbatical year.  Applicants may not receive both sabbatical leave (whole- or half-year) and a SOSA award during the same academic year.  If a faculty member or librarian decides to take a sabbatical (whole- or half-year) during one year of a two-year SOSA award, the SOSA award is forfeited for that year.

1. Applicants who apply unsuccessfully for a SOSA award in one year may reapply in subsequent years.

1. SOSA awards may not be used to reduce any full-time faculty member’s teaching load below one course unit per academic year.

1. Faculty members or librarians who are denied reappointment or tenure forfeit any SOSA award for the final year of employment.

**Types of Eligible Scholarly/Creative/Professional Activities**

The following types of scholarly/creative/professional activities are eligible to be supported by the SOSA program:

1.  **Research**

   Any of the following categories of research are eligible for support as long as they are to be communicated to the academic community beyond TCNJ.  Eligible venues for communicating research include a broad range commensurate with practices among the many disciplinary and inter-disciplinary fields in which TCNJ teacher-scholars conduct their work.  The most common include: articles in professional journals; published books, editions, textbooks, and chapters; original papers for conferences or professional societies; lecture recitals; service as editor or reviewer of scholarly works or proposals; proceedings of conferences, panels, or meetings; published manuals or handbooks to accompany texts, instruments, or equipment; software; and electronic media.

a. *The Scholarship of Discovery* – The traditional research model in which new content knowledge is acquired.

b. *The Scholarship of Integration* – The creation of new knowledge by synthesizing and making connections across disciplines or sub-disciplines.

c. *The Scholarship of Application* – The bridging of the gap between theory and practice through both research and action.

d. *The Scholarship of Pedagogy* – The discovery or evaluative analysis of the ways students learn, and the identification and assessment of methods used to foster learning.

2.  **Creative Endeavors**

   These include original works of art, creative writing, drama, documentary, music, dance, graphic design, digital arts, and architecture.  These creative outcomes are presented to the public through performances, shows, original compositions, sound or visual recordings, publications, displays or exhibits.  Activities may include participation on panels, in discussion groups, seminars, or workshops, or curating exhibitions.

3.  **Professional Activity**

   Professional activities as a consultant or practitioner are considered scholarly activity when they involve the creation, rather than the application, of knowledge and impact significantly on one’s discipline.  These activities demonstrate professional recognition of one’s scholarship at least at the local level and may include such work as original research when consulting for an outside organization, creating national standards for an accrediting organization, designing curricula for national or regional use, etc.  Documentation of professional activities may include written evaluations by peers or professional organizations.

4.  **Major Grant Application Preparation**

   Preparation of applications for highly competitive, major grants (in support of scholarly, creative, or professional activities as described above) requiring extensive advance research and documentation.

**Institutional Review Board (IRB) and**

**Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) Approval**

Faculty members who are planning research involving either human subjects or vertebrate animals must obtain approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) or the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), respectively.

•  TCNJ’s policies and procedures for IRB approval can be found at: <http://www.tcnj.edu/~irb/>.

•  TCNJ’s policies and procedures for IACUC approval can be found at:

      <http://grants.intrasun.tcnj.edu/compliance/animal.html>.

**Application Format**

Applicants should **submit 12 copies** of her/his proposal by **4:00 pm, Monday, XXXX**to the Office of Academic Affairs for the SOSA Committee’s review and recommendations to the Provost.  Late or incomplete applications will not be accepted.

A variety of previously funded proposals are available for viewing, and there will be a SOSA proposal workshop held in **XXXX**.  The locations for these will be announced.

The proposal must follow the format noted below, **otherwise it will not be reviewed**.  Please submit double-sided copies to save paper.

**1. Cover Sheet**

**Use the following format:**

Name:

Email address:

Department:

Title of proposed SOSA program/project(s):

Year(s) of last two SOSA awards:

Whether approval by IRB (human subjects) or IACUC (certain animal studies) has been received or is still needed.

The following statement, with Chairperson’s or Dean’s initials obtained (initials indicate only that a Chairperson or Dean is aware of the applicant’s intention to apply for a SOSA award.  There is no expectation that Deans or Chairpersons will read or review SOSA applications):

*I have been informed of the applicant’s intention to apply to have SOSA alternate assignment included within his/her workload.  I have discussed with the applicant the use of facilities, support staff, and any other College resources essential to the execution of his/her proposed activities.*

   Chairperson or Dean Initials\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Proposal Narrative (Description of the Proposed SOSA Program/Project)**

The SOSA Committee will evaluate each proposal based the review criteria outlined below; however, the applicant should keep in mind that non-specialists will be evaluating the proposal.  It is the applicant’s responsibility to present the proposed program/project in a clear, well-organized manner that effectively communicates the all elements of the proposal to the SOSA Committee, which is comprised of members with broad disciplinary representation.

The Proposal Narrative should be no more than 3 single-spaced pages (1-inch margins, Times New Roman font, 12 pt font;*do not exceed the page limit.  Committee members will not read beyond three single-spaced pages)*, and should include the following three titled sections:

* 1. *Assessment of Proposal* – The applicant should describe the ideas, goals, and methods of the scholarly/creative/professional program or project(s) that she/he will be conducting over the two-year SOSA award, its context and importance to the applicant’s discipline, and an indication of the eventual scholarly outcomes. The applicant’s description should include the following:

* + Description of proposed activity – an overview of the planned scholarly/creative/professional program/project(s).  The description should be scholarly, yet accessible to the non-specialist.

* + Significance – an explanation of how the applicant’s proposed work fits into the broader category of research in the field(s) being conducted by others regionally, nationally, and/or internationally.

* + Objectives – an indication of the applicant’s goals and plans for accomplishment during the two-year SOSA award period.   Specification of methods to achieve the proposed goals and a timeline of activities is often helpful in evaluating the feasibility of the proposed work.

* + Dissemination – the applicant’s expectation for sharing the results of proposed work (e.g. scholarly article, book, conference presentation, exhibition, etc.).

* 1. *Qualifications/Expertise of the Applicant* – Describe the qualifications and expertise of the faculty/librarian applicant, particularly as these are related to the applicant’s ability to conduct the proposed work and to achieve the expected objectives.  If collaborations or other resources will be needed to complete the proposed work, describe if these have been established and/or secured yet.  The applicant should also briefly summarize her/his past scholarly/creative accomplishments (including outcomes from past SOSA awards) within the context of her/his overall scholarly/creative program.

* 1. *Broader Impacts* – Explain how the SOSA award will be important for the applicant at this point in time. In particular, is the applicant pre-tenure or re-engaging in a scholarly/creative/professional area?  Where there are gaps in the chronology of the applicant’s scholarly/creative/professional record, the applicant may include a brief description of specific contextual factors (e.g., administrative roles, non-academic employment) that account for those gaps.

**3. Curriculum Vita**

   Provide a professional CV highlighting information from the applicant’s scholarly and creative work.  Please do not include copies of publications or examples of creative work.

**4. Past SOSA Award Reports**

   If the applicant has previously received a SOSA award(s) within the past five years, please include copies of the applicant’s final reports from all awards received during this five-year period of time.  Applications that lack past reports when these are required will be considered incomplete and will be disqualified.  Alternate Assignment Follow-up Report format instructions are available at:

<http://www.tcnj.edu/~academic/research/index.html>.

**Proposal Evaluation**

   **1.  Review Process**

Submitted proposals will be reviewed and evaluated by an interdisciplinary SOSA Committee.  After a norming process to standardize approaches to scoring, committee members will split into two panels to evaluate proposals using the review criteria listed below.  The full Committee will consist of 11 members, with representatives from the following units:

* + One person from each of the following schools: Arts and Communication, Business, Education, Engineering, Nursing and HES (total of 5)
	+ Two people from the School of Humanities and Social Sciences (one from Humanities, one from Social Sciences)
	+ Two people from the School of Science (one from Math/Computer Science, one from Biology/Chemistry/Physics)
	+ One person from the Library
	+ One designee from the Provost (ex officio, non-voting)

Each panel will consist of 6 people, with the Provost’s Designee sitting on both. The composition of each panel will be determined by the full SOSA Committee itself as it organizes for work each year.  Each panel will elect its own chair, who does not necessarily have to be the same person as the chair of the full SOSA Committee.

In order to avoid bias, when proposals are discussed and reviewed by panels and the full SOSA Committee, individual committee members must not introduce any outside evidence or other information that is not included in the submitted proposals.  Moreover, individual committee members must not advocate for any of the submitted proposals.  These are particularly important for proposals from the same discipline or general area of the SOSA Committee members.

In order to avoid bias for proposals submitted by SOSA Committee members, these proposals will be directed to and reviewed by the panel on which the Committee member does not serve, so that no one reviews his/her own proposal.

**2.  Review Procedures**

      The SOSA Committee will follow the major steps listed below in its review of proposals.

* 1. The full Committee will initially engage in a proposal norming step.  The full Committee will first discuss how to use and apply the evaluation rubric.  The full Committee will then review several example proposals, with each individual Committee member independently reviewing each example proposal using the evaluation rubric to assign scores.  The Chair will then compile the scores, and the full Committee will discuss the proposals, the range of scores, and the use of the rubric.  This norming step is designed to standardize approaches to scoring, establish consistency in scoring between and among reviewers, and ensure a fair and transparent evaluation process.

* 1. The full Committee will divide into two panels, with each panel reviewing approximately half of the proposals.  Individual panel members will assign preliminary scores to each proposal using the evaluation rubric.  Each panel chair will compile a summary spreadsheet of the preliminary scores, and each panel will meet to review and discuss the proposals.  Any panel member can nominate any proposal for discussion by the panel.  As a result of the discussions, panel members may choose to revise their preliminary scores.

* 1. Each panel will then submit their scores to the SOSA Chair, who will compile a summary spreadsheet and submit all preliminary scores to the full Committee.  The scores for the proposals that were submitted by SOSA committee members will be sent to the Provost’s Designee rather than to the SOSA Chair.  Scores will be normalized for each question by averaging (over the committee members), the z-scores of each applicant for each committee member.

* 1. The full Committee will re-convene for a comprehensive review of all preliminary scores, and then it will develop final scores.  Development of final scores will likely require review and discussion of those proposals needing consideration by the full Committee.  Upon review of all of the preliminary scores, individual SOSA Committee members can nominate any proposal for review and discussion by the full Committee.  The full Committee does not have to review and discuss every proposal.

* 1. Upon completion of the full Committee’s determination of final scores, the SOSA Chair will provide the final scores to the Provost’s Designee.  The Provost’s Designee will integrate the scores from any individual SOSA Committee members who had submitted proposals.  The Provost’s Designee will then submit the complete summary of final scores to the Office of Academic Affairs.

* 1. When the SOSA results are announced, applicants will receive their scores and the average scores of funded proposals in each rubric category, as well as information regarding the distribution of awards by school and faculty rank.

      **3. Review Criteria**

The applicant should keep in mind that non-specialists will be evaluating her/his proposal, so the applicant should be certain to use non-technical language that is accessible to any educated lay person. It is the applicant’s responsibility to present the proposal in a clear, well-organized, and coherent manner that effectively communicates the proposed work and its merits. SOSA Committee members will evaluate each proposal on the basis of its intellectual merit and the qualifications/expertise of the applicant.  The evaluation rubric that will be used by the SOSA Committee can be found on the last page of the Request for Proposals.

**Post-award Reporting Requirements**

Every supported faculty member and librarian must submit a final report of scholarly/creative/professional activities at the end of the grant period, to be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs on the first Monday of October. Reports will be used in the evaluation of subsequent applications.  Failure to submit a report will place future workload assignments for scholarship in jeopardy.

The report should include a brief description of 1) the nature of the scholarly/creative/professional activities carried out during the SOSA award, 2) the objectives and expected outcomes from the original, funded SOSA proposal, and 3) a short explanation of how they were met or why they were not met.  Instructions for the format of the *Alternate Assignments Follow-up Report* are available online:

<http://www.tcnj.edu/~academic/research/index.html>.

Interim reports at the end of the first year of a two-year award are not necessary.

**Evaluation Rubric for SOSA Applications**

Applicant’s Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Correct format?     Yes   No

Previous SOSA funding?  Yes   No

**Score definitions:**

0 absent / 1 poor / 2 barely adequate / 3 fair / 4 good / 5 very good / 6 excellent / 7 outstanding

**Score the following**categories**based on how they are presented in the proposal, in both content and clarity.**

***Assessment of Proposal* Score =    (max 42 pts)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Coherence of the scholarly/creative/professional ideas and work proposed | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Proposed objectives *(What are you trying to do?)* | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Detailed research plan with proposed timeline*. (How are you trying to do it?)* | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Expected scholarly/creative/professional outcomes*(What will you do with the results?)* | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Importance/significance to the discipline and to applicant’s ongoing scholarly/creative/professional program (sets the proposal within the appropriate context) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Potential for the proposed work to yield tangible scholarly/ creative/professional outcomes (e.g., publications, grants, performances, new scholarly directions, etc.) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**Qualifications/Expertise of the Applicant  Score =    (max 21 pts)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scholarly/creative/professional qualifications of the applicant to conduct the proposed work | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Overall body of scholarly/creative/professional outcomes within the context of the applicant’s program (taking into consideration the applicant’s career stage) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Recent scholarly/creative/professional outcomes within the past 4 years (taking into consideration the applicant’s service obligations and any past SOSA awards) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**Total Score**(Assessment of Proposal+ Qualifications/Expertise)**=    (max 63 pts)**

**Broader Impacts for the Applicant and TCNJ Score =    (max 2 pts)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Applicant is pre-tenure *or*Applicant is re-engaging in scholarship/creative/professional activity | Y(2 pts) | N |

      **Final Score**(Total Score + Broader Impacts)**=    (max 65 pts)**