The College of Social Science Faculty Initiatives Fund 2022-23 Call for Proposals

The College of Social Science invites applications for competitive awards under the Faculty Initiatives Fund (FIF). The FIF was established by Dr. Gwen Andrew, Professor Emeritus and Dean Emeritus of the College of Social Science with the support of the College's faculty, staff, friends and alumni. The FIF is limited to tenure system faculty members holding primary appointments (51% or higher) in the College of Social Science and who have not received FIF funding during the past three years. The endowment recognizes and encourages the innovative and creative work of these faculty members.

The FIF promotes the production and dissemination of knowledge by supporting faculty research initiatives, development of new outreach and engagement efforts, and the publication of "pioneering" works that otherwise would not find outlets among commercial publishers. Applications that represent pilot activities that will lead to proposals for external funding are particularly encouraged. During recent award cycles, the College has funded 5-6 applicants. A minimum match of $1,000 from the applicant's unit is required. The average award in recent years has been $6,000.

Applications for the FY 2022-23 awards are due in the Dean's Office no later than 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 1, 2022 (no time extension requests will be allowed). Proposals are limited to two pages (single-spaced, 11-point Arial or Times Roman font, one-inch margins. References, curriculum vitae, detailed budget and budget justification should be included as appendixes), and must clearly articulate methods, offer a concise statement of expected outcomes, and justify the use of this particular funding mechanism. A brief letter from the unit chair/director with a commitment for the required matching funds must accompany each application. Applications must be submitted electronically via email as a single PDF file by 5:00 p.m., March 1, 2022 to the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies at SSC.researchdean@msu.edu. All proposals will be evaluated using processes and criteria adapted from the National Institutes of Health.

Proposals will be reviewed by members of the College Research Committee and award recipients will be notified by Friday, April 29, 2022. All award decisions are final.

Instructions for accessing funds will be provided at the time of notification. Funds may be used for expenses related to the project as submitted, consistent with University Policy and Procedures, but may not be used for faculty salaries or conference travel and expenses. Any equipment valued at $500 or more purchased from these funds becomes the property of the University. A brief report is required within 12 months of the award date describing outcomes and plans for follow-up.

Tuesday, January 18, 2022

Review Questions

I. QUALITY AND TECHNICAL MERIT
   a. Does the proposal demonstrate an awareness of the state of current research?
   b. Does the proposal describe a sound methodology, analytic or technical approach?
   c. How feasible is the proposed project?
   d. Does the proposal suggest an innovation and creative approach to address a problem?

II. IMPACT OF THE PROJECT
   a. Does the proposed work hold potential for the advancement of science?
   b. Is the proposed work relevant to policy and practice?
   c. Is this project likely to attract additional sponsored activities?

III. CAPABILITIES, DEMONSTRATED PRODUCTIVITY, AND EXPERIENCE OF APPLICANTS
   a. Does the PI demonstrate the ability to complete the proposed effort?
   b. Does the applicant demonstrate a record of successful past performance?

IV. BUDGET CONSIDERATION
   a. Is the FIF an appropriate mechanism to advance this work?
   b. Are the budgeted project costs appropriate for the level of effort?

Scoring Table for FIF Research Grants (adopted from NIH guidelines)

Impact	Impact/Priority Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
High	1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
	2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
	3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
Moderate	4	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
	5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
	6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
Low	7	Fair	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
	8	Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
	9	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses
Definitions			
Minor: easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen the impact of the project Moderate: weakness that lessens the impact of the project Major: weakness that severely limits the impact of the project			