Chairperson or Dean:

Please review this summer research proposal being submitted by a faculty member from your Department/School. The Faculty Development Review Committee (FDRC) will be reviewing and ranking these proposals for possible funding, and they value your assessment of the scholarship merits of this proposal. They also welcome your comments on the significance of this work for your discipline and for the advancement of this applicant's research program.

Applicant Name: ________________________________

Department: ________________________________

School/College: ________________________________

Proposal Title: ________________________________

Chairperson's or dean’s signature: ________________________________

Chairperson or Dean: Please enter your recommendation in this space. It will expand as you type.
Name: ________________________________

Department: __________________________

School/College: ________________________

Project Title: __________________________

Please indicate if any of the following apply to your study:

Biohazards: ____________________________

Human Subjects: ________________________

Animal Care: __________________________

Radiation: _____________________________

If your answer to any of the above is either ‘yes’ or ‘uncertain,’ please contact the Office of Research Services by e-mail, ORS@luc.edu. The applicant must obtain the requisite approvals before the project can formally begin.
**Directions:** This application consists of seven (7) sections, each with specific items to be included. Please address each section in order, attaching as many pages as necessary. Incomplete applications will not be considered.

---

**I. ABSTRACT**—**Non-technical summary of the proposed scholarship activity:** This should be a brief statement that will be understandable to educated non-specialists, describing both the nature of the activity and its significance for the applicant’s career, as well as its broader value to Loyola. Applicants should limit this abstract to **300 words**.

---

**II. TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:** Describe in appropriate detail the proposed activity, including:

a. The significance to the field and importance of the proposed outcomes.

b. For research/ creative activities, it is essential to include a discussion of the theoretical approaches, methodologies, types of data/information, and a discussion of how this work will contribute to the broader discipline.

c. For all categories of projects, the technical description should include the applicant’s qualifications to conduct the project and should be developed in a form consistent with applications for external support or another form appropriate for the specific discipline.

d. The technical description should be supported by appropriate citations and a bibliography. Applicants should limit the body of this technical description to no more than **2,000 words**, delivered in double-spaced format.

---

**III. STATEMENT OF INDIVIDUAL, PROGRAMATTIC, and INSTITUTIONAL IMPACT:** Discuss the benefits of the proposed activity to you, your unit within the university and to Loyola as a whole.

a. Indicate how the proposed activity relates to your previous work and how it will contribute to your future work.

b. Indicate how this award might enhance potential for future extramural support of your research or other creative endeavors.

c. Indicate why an award is necessary to accomplish this project rather than doing it as a part of the normal workload expected of all faculty. Applicants should limit this section to no more than **400 words**, delivered in double-spaced format.
IV. **EXTRAMURAL RESOURCES: (if applicable)**
   a. If resources external to Loyola are required and/or included in your proposal (e.g., laboratories or facilities of other institutions, acceptances in programs offered at other institutions, additional funding by outside agencies), specify those resources and indicate what advanced preparation you have made to secure these resources.
   b. Also indicate what alternative means will be employed to complete your project if outside resources are not forthcoming. Applicants should limit this section to no more than **300 words**, delivered in double-spaced format.

V. **TIMELINE and DISSEMINATION PLAN:**
   a. Delineate the projected timeline for completion of the proposed project.
   b. Discuss how you will publish, present or disseminate your scholarship as a result of this award. Detail your plans for submitting publications, manuscripts, extramural funding proposals, and/or presenting the results of your scholarship as a result of this award. Applicants should limit this section to no more than **300 words**, delivered in double-spaced format.

VI. **APPENDICES, if appropriate:**
   a. If appropriate, appendices may be included that will help peer reviewers to understand the proposal, (example diagrams, tables and figures, original creative work in the arts, reviews of exhibitions or performances, photographs, etc.).
   b. If you were awarded a summer research stipend within the last three years, indicate when these funds were awarded and describe the outcome of the research for which they were awarded, such as external grants, creative works, presentations, or publications. Attach a copy of your final report(s) for all previous awards during this time period.

VII. **CURRICULUM VITAE:** Full and current *Curriculum Vitae*—attach at end of application.
### Summer Research Stipend Proposal Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Categories</th>
<th>Unacceptable for Funding 1</th>
<th>Marginal 2</th>
<th>Adequate 3</th>
<th>Superior 4</th>
<th>Ready for Funding: Exceptional 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive-ness of Proposal</td>
<td>Cursory description of project</td>
<td>Brief description of project</td>
<td>Adequate description of project</td>
<td>Detailed description of project</td>
<td>Completely and cogently detailed description of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Proposal</td>
<td>Proposal language is overly discipline-oriented and so unclear to reviewers.</td>
<td>Proposal language is clearer, details are more comprehensible to reviewers.</td>
<td>Proposal language enables reviewers to comprehend the proposal adequately.</td>
<td>Proposal language is very clear and enables reviewers readily to comprehend the proposal.</td>
<td>Proposal is pellucid to reviewers, complementing comprehensive-ness, clarity, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievable Goals</td>
<td>Goals as specified are unrealistic and unattainable.</td>
<td>Specified goals seem attainable.</td>
<td>Attainment of specified goals is likely.</td>
<td>Specified goals will be attained.</td>
<td>Timetable specifies systematic progression toward clearly attainable goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method for Completing the Project Proposed</td>
<td>No statement provided</td>
<td>Minimal statement</td>
<td>Adequate statement</td>
<td>Method is described in some detail</td>
<td>Steps for completing project are stated in detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Expertise of the Researcher</td>
<td>Weak or no description provided</td>
<td>Inadequate description</td>
<td>Adequate description</td>
<td>Expertise is described in some detail</td>
<td>Thorough description of expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project’s Impact</td>
<td>Weak or no statement provided</td>
<td>Inadequate statement</td>
<td>Adequate statement</td>
<td>Impact is described in some detail</td>
<td>Thorough description of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination Plan</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>Minimal description of dissemination plan</td>
<td>Adequate description of dissemination plan</td>
<td>Dissemination plan is described in some detail</td>
<td>Thorough description of dissemination plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>None included</td>
<td>Some included/dated</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Detailed listing</td>
<td>Thorough listing of well-qualified references</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>