

2022 SUMMER FACULTY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

About the Program: The Summer Faculty Fellowship Program (SFFP) is for individual tenure-track, tenured faculty and full-time librarians who are involved in an active program of scholarship. SFFP defines scholarship to include: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. The program aims to provide salary support for efforts to build on previous scholarly or creative endeavors (e.g., for the writing of scholarly products or grant proposals) or to move projects in a new direction (research that could provide the basis for future proposals). The fellowship amount is \$7,100 paid during the summer pay periods.

Eligibility: All full-time tenure-track, tenured faculty and full-time librarians who did not receive a 2020 or 2021 SFFP Award, with the following stipulations:

- Faculty holding endowed chairs are ineligible if they receive research funding as part of the chair.
- Faculty receiving summer research funding from another SU funding program are not eligible.
- Faculty receiving a summer stipend/salary from an external grant or fellowship will not be considered.
- Recipients may not teach more than one summer course.
- Full-time employment the subsequent year is required for receipt of funds (faculty on sabbatical will be counted as full-time employees during their sabbatical).

Application process: Submit the completed proposal by email to osp@seattleu.edu by 5 pm November 5, 2021. Proposals received after the due date and time will not be considered.

Proposal Format: The project proposal should be at least 11-point font size with one-inch margins, single-spaced, maximum of five pages in length. **Proposals must include the following:**

1. **Cover page** (see next page)
2. **Project proposal (maximum length 5 pages)**, written for an audience of colleagues not in your discipline and addressing the following areas:
 - a. *Introduction, significance and purpose of the project* (How does the project contribute to significant questions or knowledge in your discipline?)
 - b. *Description of the project*, including goals, expected results, and timeline
 - c. *Benefits of the project to applicant's research program* and specifically how the program will be advanced
 - d. *Previous levels of research support* received and summary of results, and specifically if your research has benefited from a previous Summer Faculty Fellowship.
3. **Brief professional vita (maximum length 5 pages. Please include any relevant trainings, presentations, or publications you may have)**

Selection Criteria:

1. Clarity of proposal - needs to be easily understood by readers not in the discipline (10 pts.)
2. Significance of topic within the applicant's academic discipline (10 pts.)
3. Project's potential to advance the applicant's program of research (10 pts.)
4. Realistic project completion timeline (5 pts.)
5. Results from previous research support or potential for continued scholarship (5 pts.)

Please see attached scoring rubric for further detail

Announcement of Awards: Applicants will be notified by January 2022.

Fellowship Requirements: Summer Faculty Fellowship recipients are required to submit a report on the results of their work to the Office of Sponsored Projects by November 1, 2022.

Questions: Contact Jenna Isakson, OSP Director (isaksonj@seattleu.edu)

SEATTLE UNIVERSITY.

2022 Summer Faculty Fellowship Program Proposal Submission Cover Page

Faculty Member Name:

Title of Proposal:

College or School:

Department:

Make sure to review the eligibility guidelines before submission of your proposal. Please email proposal as a single PDF to osp@seattleu.edu by *5pm November 5, 2021*. **Proposals received after the deadline will not be considered.** *Submit your proposals as a single PDF document saved as: Last Name, First Name, SFF 2022 Proposal.* Submissions must include:

- This cover page
- Project proposal
- Abbreviated Professional Vita

Will this project require Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for human subjects?

Yes

No

Will you be teaching or have other sources of funding in Summer 2022?

Yes

Please add any comments below to clarify your yes or no answer if needed:

No

Have you been a recipient of a Summer Faculty Fellowship? Please note, 2020 & 2021 SFF recipients are ineligible.

Yes

No

2022 Summer Faculty Fellowship Rubric

1. Clarity of proposal – needs to be easily understood by readers not in the discipline

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Reader with general knowledge is given field-specific information needed to understand project purpose and context. Proposal is easy to follow and informative.			Purpose uses terms not generally understood or is not clear on specifically how purpose relates to project. There may be distracting errors in grammar.				Unclear, very general or vague. Proposal difficult to follow. Reader has to work to understand the purpose or project. Poorly written.			

2. Significance to the academic discipline

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Clear statement of project and how its goals and results will contribute to existing knowledge in the applicant's discipline. Reader (without specific knowledge of the field) is convinced of project's importance to discipline. Or clear and convincing evidence is provided to the general reader as to the importance of the project.			Project is described without clear statement of goals or of how research furthers the field. Points may be vague so the connection with academic discipline is unclear. Yet the project appears to have the potential to contribute to knowledge in the discipline.				Goals are missing or writer fails to describe potential contribution of research to the discipline. Expected results may be vague or missing. Reader is unconvinced that this project will further the discipline. Routine project.			

3. Project's potential to advance the applicant's program of research

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Reader is convinced that the project has the potential to elevate the applicant's research to a higher level. A must-do for this applicant.			Some benefits are to be realized, but the potential advance to the applicant's program is not as great or as convincing.				Unconvincing, or benefits are not delineated clearly, or there may be some key points or questions that remain unanswered.			

4. Realistic project completion timeline

5	4	3	2	1	0
Timeline is realistic for completion of project. Project scope is realistic for time period. Adequate information is provided to assist the reader in judging the timeline for the project.			Timeline lacking in detail or relationship to project completion is unclear.		

5. Previous levels of research support and promise of continued scholarship

5	4	3	2	1	0
Previous support gives reader confidence that the project will be successful. Clear evidence of promise for continued scholarship.			Previous support not described in detail or results were not clearly described. Record of accomplishment is thin. Had a previous SFF without record of enhancement.		