The General Research Fund was established by the Kansas Legislature in 1951 for the purpose of encouraging and supporting research at the University. The General Research Fund competition provides the opportunity for faculty from each school or college to submit proposals that focus on furthering their scholarly research.

Each school or college appoints a review committee to provide peer review of funding proposals (in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences that takes place within six entities by discipline type) and select awardees. Each entity may choose to use these funds in the most appropriate manner to further research in their school or college. Individual awards may be made to faculty investigators. Funds may also be used to increase support for graduate students or may be allocated in other ways to further research.

Under the GRA Tuition Assistance program introduced by the Provost in November 2002, doctoral students funded from Competition General Research funds who meet all eligibility criteria may be eligible to have at least some portion of their tuition paid from the GRA Tuition Assistance pool. The tuition assistance pool is funded from the tuition enhancement program implemented in the current academic year. For more information regarding the GRA Tuition Assistance policy, please see http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/graduate/chart.shtml.

NOTE: GRF funds are allocated for the entire fiscal year starting July 1, 2017, and the proposal should be formulated accordingly. Proposals will be reviewed by the Review Committees, and announcement of allocations will be made by the middle of April. All awards are contingent upon action on the University’s budget by the Kansas Legislature.
I. ELIGIBILITY

*New Faculty:* New tenure track, untenured faculty members in any division must apply to the New Faculty General Research Fund before applying to this competition.

A. Eligibility (Humanities)

All faculty with tenured or tenure-track appointments in Humanities Departments and Programs, or whose research project is best characterized as employing humanistic methods, are eligible to submit proposals within the following constraints:

1. Faculty who hold the appropriate terminal degree and are within 10 years of their initial tenure-track appointment at KU or elsewhere are eligible to receive allocations every year.

2. Faculty who hold the appropriate terminal degree and are beyond 10 years of their initial tenure-track appointment at KU or elsewhere may not receive GRF allocations in consecutive years.

3. Applicants may receive GRF support for no more than one year for work leading to an article or book chapter. In evaluating applications for support for book-length projects, the Review Committee will take in account the applicant’s progress on the proposed book.

B. Eligibility (Social Sciences and Behavioral Sciences)

All faculty with tenured or tenure-track appointments in Social and Behavioral Science departments are eligible to submit proposals for one GRF. Individuals will be eligible for GRFs only two of any three year period. Proposals from/to entities other than the Social Sciences and Behavioral Sciences are not encouraged. However, joint proposals within the Social Sciences and within the Behavioral Sciences are encouraged. Cross-entity team proposals will be considered but funding for individual researchers must be shared by all entities involved.

C. Eligibility for Physical Sciences and Mathematics (except Chemistry)

All faculty with tenure-track or tenured appointments in Physical Sciences and Mathematics Departments are eligible to submit proposals for a GRF each year.

D. Eligibility for Life Sciences (EEB and MB)

All faculty with tenure-track or tenured appointments in EEB and MB are eligible to
submit proposals for a GRF each year (see Review Criteria starting on page 9 to determine likelihood of success.)

Faculty with affiliate appointment in EEB and MB must receive permission from the Chair of the Department prior to submission. Proposals cannot be accepted from graduate students.

E. Eligibility (School of the Arts)
All faculty with tenured or tenure-track appointments in departments within the School of the Arts are eligible to submit proposals within the following constraints:

1. Faculty who are within 10 years of their initial tenure-track appointment at KU or elsewhere are eligible to receive allocations every year.

2. Faculty who are beyond 10 years of their initial tenure-track appointment at KU or elsewhere may not receive GRF allocations in consecutive years.

3. Applicants may receive GRF support for no more than one year for work leading to an article, book chapter, exhibition, or other creative project. In evaluating applications for support of larger and more complex book-length or creative projects, the Review Committee will take into account the applicant’s progress on the proposed book or project in determining whether another year of GRF funding is appropriate.

II. COMPETITION DEADLINES AND FUNDING

Applications must be submitted by the deadline established by applicant’s school or college. The completed proposal must be received in the appropriate Dean’s office on or before the deadline. GRF funds are allocated for the entire fiscal year starting July 1, 2017. The Review Committee will review proposals and determine the award recipients before the beginning of the fiscal year. All awards are from state funds and are contingent upon approval of the University’s budget by the Kansas Legislature.

A. Deadline for Humanities, Social Sciences and Behavioral Sciences, Physical Sciences and Mathematics (Except Chemistry), EEB and MB, School of the Arts

One electronic version of the completed application is due to Maureen Cole (maucole@ku.edu) to the College Dean’s Office, 200 Strong Hall by 12:00 noon on Friday, February 10, 2017.

The budget page must contain the signature of the applicant, department chair.

Late or incomplete proposals will not be considered.
NOTE: Your department may create internal deadlines for submission of the proposals to the chair, please contact your department for details.

III. PROPOSAL APPLICATION

A. The proposal must be submitted on the following provided form and the entire form must be completed. Page limits must be observed and all instructions followed. The research plan should be no longer than five (5) pages. Poor preparation or lack of clarity may jeopardize the success of the proposal. Both scholarly and creative proposals are invited.

B. Your expected outcomes and any future funding opportunities from the award must be described on your award application.

C. You may access the unit contacts and deadline dates on the KUCR website at http://www.rgs.ku.edu/funding/grf.shtml

While additional explanatory information may be included, applicants may not submit copies of applications for other granting agencies instead of this form. The Review Committee will not interview the applicant in order to understand and evaluate the proposal. The proposal itself should convey an adequate portrait of the applicant’s competencies, interests, achievements, and goals. The application must contain all pertinent information necessary for a thorough evaluation. In the interests of practicality and equity, the Review Committee will not accept additional information after the college deadline.

I. Proposal Types

A. Proposal Submission (Social Sciences, Behavioral Sciences, School of the Arts and Humanities)

The proposal consists of:

1. One-page abstract/summary of Research Objectives.
2. Budget form signed by the applicant and the department chair.
3. One-page abstract, a text of not more than 1,200 words or no more than five (5) pages, and two (2) pages of references.
4. Two-page curriculum vita and reports on previous GRFs are required. Please follow the instructions on the following pages.
5. Future sources of funding.
6. Reports on previous GRF allocations.
7. Previous outside support.
Please note maximum PAGE LIMITATION of two (2) pages for the C.V. emphasizing the recent record of the applicant. The C.V. must include:

1. Dates of all academic degrees
2. Dates of all academic appointments, indicating whether or not tenure track
3. Grants and awards received, with dates
4. Scholarly and creative research and publication history (include summary, plus publications from the past 5 years.)

B. Proposal Submissions (Physical Sciences and Mathematics)

1. Abstract and signed budget (applicant/chairperson) page plus the proposal.
2. A list of the previous successful two GRF applications, with date and results.
3. A two-page C.V. with recent publications and current and pending grants.
4. A brief note about the expected outcomes and leveraging of any sort anticipated from the award.

C. Proposal Submissions (EEB and MB)

1. Small Grants
   Some funds will be available for small but critical expenditures to cover unexpected emergencies or unanticipated costs in a research project. The maximum amount available is $1000. Proposals should comprise of a GRF budget sheet, the University Regulations for Research Projects form, and single page stating the emergency or unexpected nature of the need and the importance of the equipment/material in the faculty member's research program. Although an explicit plan for submission of a grant proposal to an outside agency resulting from the research is obviously inappropriate for these small grants, the letter should include a brief statement how the funds will improve one’s overall research capability and, thus, one’s competitiveness in procuring larger grants.

2. Regular Grants
   Regular GRF grants average in amount from less than $10,000 to approximately $15,000. There is no limit on the amount requested, but because funds are limited, typical allocations fall within the above range. Proposals must include the following:
   
   a. A cover page with the title, your name, amount requested, and abstract of the proposal
   b. A detailed description of the proposed research (4-page maximum, excluding figures and bibliography) such that the reviewers can judge
the scientific merit of the research

c. A detailed budget (see below)
d. Justification for all budget items
e. An explanation of how the results of the proposed research will enhance the competitiveness of a proposal to an external agency, including an explicit plan, with timetable, for the assembly and submission of a grant proposal resulting from the proposed research, if successful (the name of the anticipated funding agency for the submission of the proposal must also be included)
f. A recent curriculum vitae

In addition, the larger proposal must include a section detailing the specific products and outcome of all GRF proposals received in the previous three years. The information should be broken down in the following manner for each previous GRF award funded (including all items; list “none” where appropriate):

a. Number of graduate students supported by the funding
b. Number of undergraduate students supported by the funding
c. List of peer-reviewed articles published (provide complete citations)
d. List of non-peer-reviewed articles published (provide complete citations)
e. Books published (provide complete citations)
f. List of grant proposals submitted (provide agency, amount, time period, title, names of co-PIs, if any, and outcome of funding request)
g. List of special rewards received as a result of the work (provide details)
h. List of presentations made at meetings, conferences, other universities, etc. (provide name of presenter, title, date, location, name of meeting/university)
i. Patents/licenses resulting from the work
j. Any other outcomes from the work (explain)
k. Any news/media stories about the work (provide date, title of story, nature of medium)

IV. Budget Preparation

A. Budget (Social Sciences, Behavioral Sciences, Physical Sciences and Mathematics, School of the Arts, and Humanities)

1. Salaries for faculty investigators

   These salaries can be included if necessary to support research and to maintain continuity of research during the summer. Each Social and Behavioral Science faculty investigator is limited to a salary for two bi-weekly pay periods OR a maximum of $7,000 (salary and fringe benefits), whichever is less. Each Humanities and School of the Arts faculty
investigator is limited to a salary for two bi-weekly pay periods OR $5,888 (salary and fringe benefits), whichever is less.

3. Fringe benefit costs
   The cost of fringe benefits associated with the payment of salary must be included in the budget. Add 28% for faculty/staff and 4% for students.

4. Salaries for research assistants
   Salaries for graduate research assistants should quote the GRA/GTA pay matrix appropriate to the department in the PI’s department or unit.

5. Consumable materials
   Reasonable amounts of materials may be requested in the proposal including research related travel, per diem to sites, and other materials deemed necessary for the project. Budget items considered inappropriate include:
   a. Salary of faculty members during the academic year
   b. Items of equipment
   c. Payments to consultants
   d. Reprint costs
   e. Computing costs
   f. Salaries for technicians, clerical and stenographic help
   g. Travel and associated cost to attend professional meetings

B. Budget (EEB and MB)
   All budget items must be numerically prioritized according to their critical need to complete the research. Please note: proposals lacking this prioritization will not be considered. Also, the budget should reflect the availability of funds from July 1, 2017 until June 30, 2018.

V. Evaluation Procedures

A. Evaluation Procedures for Humanities

The Humanities Review Committee (HRC) will consist of eight (8) regular members of the Humanities faculty selected by the Associate Dean of the College for the Humanities. Nominees must be individuals with records of successful research and publication. Regular members will serve two-year terms. Present applications for GRFs will be excluded from HRC membership. The Associate Dean for the Humanities will serve as ex officio, non-voting member of the HRC.

To avoid conflicts of interest, department chairs will not serve on the HRC.
Directors of interdisciplinary programs which have few or no budgeted faculty members may serve on the HRC. The HRC will feel free to contact a chair for information it deems appropriate for an adequate evaluation of a particular proposal. In the case of proposals whose content is beyond the expertise of the HRC, the Committee will seek, in the consultation with the applicant and the applicant’s chair, the confidential written opinions of appropriate members of the University faculty.

At its initial meeting each year, the HRC will elect one of its members as Chair, review the application form and guidelines, and set a later meeting date for final decisions. The HRC members will rank the proposals from highest to lowest, 1 to 27, for example, if there are 27 proposals (or 1 to 36, if there are 36 proposals). Rankings will be turned in to the College Office at least 48 hours before the final meeting. At the final meeting, the HRC members will be given a ranked list of proposals from the highest to the lowest.

The HRC will provide a ranked list with recommended levels of funding to the Vice Chancellor of the KU Research Foundation. Decisions of the HRC are final; GRF awards will be determined solely by the HRC. All awards are contingent upon approval of the University's budget by the Kansas legislature.

B. Evaluation Procedures for Social Sciences

The Social Sciences review committee consists of six (6) members, drawn from units represented in the category. The procedure for nominations involves the chairs nominating two to three faculty who could serve as appropriate reviewers and who themselves do not plan to submit a GRF proposal that year. The Dean and the Associate Dean of the College will select the members of the review committee from among the nominations, providing as wide a range of representation as possible across departments. Membership on the committee is for two years on a staggered basis. Individuals submitting GRF proposals are not eligible to serve on the committee.

The Review Committee will be charged with evaluating the proposals, following guidelines developed by the Social Sciences Entity. After their considerations and working within the budget restrictions, the Committee will provide a ranked list with recommended level of funding to the Vice Chancellor for Research and Public Service. The decisions of the Committee are final and the GRF award will be solely determined by the GRF Committee. Because of the large number of anticipated submissions, written feedback will be extremely limited. Unsuccessful applicants will receive feedback in the form of a summary of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the application. Additional information regarding proposals can be
obtained from the Review Committee chair.

C. Evaluation Procedures for Behavioral Sciences

The Behavioral Sciences Review Committee will consist of six (6) members who will serve staggering two-year terms. The members of the Review Committee will be selected as follows: the chairs of the four departments will nominate three to five faculty members who could serve as appropriate reviewers and who themselves do not plan to submit a GRF proposal this year; the Dean and Associate Dean of the College will select the members of the review committee from among the nominations, provided that all three departments are represented on the committee each year and membership on the committee is equally distributed over the three departments. **Chairs of the departments will not be eligible** to serve on the Review Committee. The Associate Dean of the College will convene the first meeting and the members of the Review Committee will elect a chair at this meeting.

The Review Committee will be charged with evaluating the proposals, following guidelines developed by the Behavioral Sciences Entity. In the rare case that no one on the Review Committee has sufficient expertise to evaluate a proposal, the Review Committee may solicit one or more evaluations from faculty who are not on the committee. After their considerations and working within the budget restrictions, the Review Committee will provide a ranked list with recommended level of funding to the Vice Chancellor for Research, Graduate Studies and Public Service. The decisions of the Committee are final and the GRF award will be solely determined by the GRF Committee. Applicants will be provided brief written feedback regarding the evaluation of their proposals. Additional information regarding proposals can be obtained from the Review Committee chair.

D. Evaluation Procedures for Physical Sciences and Mathematics

The review committees for the Physical Sciences and Mathematics entity will consist of faculty members nominated by the chairs of the relevant departments and approved by the Dean and Divisional Associate Dean, who would be responsible for reviewing proposals submitted by that department’s faculty. Reviewers should have strong records of scholarly productivity and, preferably, a record of funded research.

Each applicant will receive detailed, constructive, written feedback from the departmental review committee. Applicants may discuss their reviews with the appropriate Divisional Associate Dean or the Department Chair if they wish.

Each department will determine its own review mechanism and prepare a rank ordering of its proposals, along with a recommendation on the funding for each
proposal to the Associate Dean who will follow historical precedent in dividing funds among departments.

E. Evaluation Procedure for EEB

Following the submission deadline, the Chair of the Department will assemble an ad hoc GRF Proposal Review Committee (PRC) to evaluate the submitted proposals and to recommend funding for those judged to be meritorious (see detailed Review Criteria below), based primarily on the scientific merit of the proposed research will substantially improve the competitiveness of a subsequently submitted grant proposal. Results of past GRF funding will also be taken into consideration, past submission of the promised grant proposal to an outside agency will improve the current chances for obtaining GRF funds, whereas failure to have submitted the promised proposal will diminish the chances of another round of funding.

Given the necessity of in-house evaluation of the proposals, members of the PRC will be kept confidential. Please note that faculty members who have recently received GRF funding, but who have not submitted a proposal for the current year, are committed to serve as reviewers.

For proposals judged worthy of funding, the Chair of the Department may omit some budget items, based on the evaluations provided by PRC, in order to fund all proposals recommended for funding. Based on feedback from the PRC, the Chair will provide written feedback to faculty members whose proposals were not recommended for funding. All decisions are final. Notification of the outcome of the evaluation procedure will normally occur by the end of February.

F. Evaluation Procedure for MB

The Department chairperson will assemble an ad hoc GRF Review Committee (GRC) to evaluate the submitted proposals and to recommend funding for those judged to be meritorious based on the review criteria described below. Given the necessity to review the proposals in-house, members of the GRC will be confidential. Evaluation will be based primarily on the scientific merit of the proposed research and the likelihood that the outcome of the research will substantially improve the competitiveness of a grant proposal to be drafted for subsequent submission to an external agency. Success of past GRF funding will also be taken into consideration; particular attention will be paid to submission of grant proposals based on GRF results; failure to submit proposals will reduce the chances of funding. Written feedback will be provided to faculty members whose proposals were not recommended for funding. All decisions are final. All applicants will be notified of the outcome of the evaluation procedure within three weeks of
the submission deadline.

**G. Evaluation Procedure for School of the Arts**

The School of the Arts Review Committee (SOTA-RC) will consist of five (5) regular members of the SOTA faculty selected by the Associate Dean representing all departments in the School. Nominees must be individuals with records of successful research, publication, and/or creative activity. Individuals applying for GRFs will be excluded from SOTA-RC membership. The Associate Dean will serve as ex officio, non-voting member of the review committee.

To avoid conflicts of interest, department chairs will not serve on the SOTA-RC. The SOTA-RC will feel free to contact a chair for information it deems appropriate for an adequate evaluation of a particular proposal. In the case of proposals whose content is beyond the expertise of the SOTA-RC, the Committee will seek, in the consultation with the applicant and the applicant’s chair, the confidential written opinions of appropriate members of the University faculty.

At its initial meeting each year, the SOTA-RC will elect one of its members as Chair, review the application form and guidelines, and set a later meeting date for final decisions. The SOTA-RC members will rank the proposals from highest to lowest, 1 to 27, for example, if there are 27 proposals (or 1 to 36, if there are 36 proposals). Rankings will be turned in to the College Office at least 48 hours before the final meeting. At the final meeting, the SOTA-RC members will be given a ranked list of proposals form the highest to the lowest.

The SOTA-RC will provide a ranked list with recommended levels of funding to the Vice Chancellor of the KU Research Foundation. Decisions of the SOTA-RC are final; GRF awards will be determined solely by the SOTA-RC. All awards are contingent upon approval of the University’s budget by the Kansas legislature.

**VI. Review Criteria**

The primary criterion is merit of the proposal. The concept of merit includes more than the scholarly excellence of the proposal. It also includes the benefit to the institution and to the individual, as well as such factors as an applicant’s administrative responsibilities, the need for research support for sabbatical leave, the problems of moving into a new research field, the inaccessibility of funds to younger faculty, etc. Thus, the review subcommittees will consider the following criteria in evaluating individual project applications.

**A. Review Criteria for Humanities**
1. Scholarly Importance  (40 points maximum)
   a. What is the importance of the project or of the questions addressed in terms of the applicant’s discipline?
   b. Will completion of the project lead to significant scholarly publications or artistic achievement?

2. Quality of Research and Methodology; Feasibility  (30 points maximum)
   a. Does the research plan reflect adequate knowledge of the relevant background and professional literature?
   b. Is the methodology appropriate to the research or artistic objective?
   c. Given the scholarly record of the candidate (see IV and VI on the application), is there a clear likelihood of successful completion of the project in the time indicated?

3. Research and/or Creative Record of Applicant (30 points maximum) (to include recent success in GRF-funded projects and in applying for outside funding)
   Given the applicant’s time in the field, does she or he have an adequate record of scholarly accomplishment?

For assistance in applying for outside funding, faculty should contact Kathy Porsch, Research Development Officer, in the Humanities Research Center, Hall Center for Humanities (864-7834 or kporsch@ku.edu)

NOTE: The Humanities Research Committee expects applicants to meet standards imposed by external funding agencies, i.e., applicants should follow instructions about page limits, C.V. content, explanation of methodology, etc.

B. Review Criteria for Social Sciences

1. Significance  (15 points maximum)
   a. What is the importance of the project to the proposer’s discipline or the interdisciplinary endeavor?
   b. Will the project lead to subsequent scholarly publications and/or grant related research activity?

2. Research/Creative Plan (40 points maximum)
   a. Are the research objectives clearly stated?
   b. Does the research plan reflect adequate knowledge of related literature?
   c. Does the research plan describe the research methods adequately?
   d. Does the research plan address the research objectives?
e. Is there a reasonable likelihood of successful completion within the time, budget, and facilities limitations suggested?

2. Qualifications of Proposer (20 points maximum)
   a. Is the proposer qualified to complete the proposed research?
   b. Has he or she shown evidence of scholarly capability and productivity?
   c. Has past GRF support produced results?

3. Evidence of Scholarly Activity (15 points maximum)
   Applications will be regarded unfavorably if the applicant has shown no record of scholarly productivity. Applications will also be regarded unfavorably if the applicant has not attempted to secure external support for research projects if available. It is recognized that outside support is less available in some disciplines than in others but applicants are encouraged to investigate funding opportunities and to apply for external funding whenever possible. Applicants who have received prior allocations from the General Research Fund must state the results of the two most recent projects. If a renewal is sought, the applicant must report the progress already made and the expected completion date. If a project has been abandoned, the reasons must be stated in detail. Ordinarily, abandoning or failing to complete a prior project without adequate explanation will cause disapproval of subsequent applications.

4. Readability of Application (5 points maximum)
   In the past some faculty members have presented applications in highly technical and complex language. Such proposals might prove problematic to intelligent scholars of good will but of various sub-specialties. An application must be designed so that all members of the Review Committee can read and understand.

5. Additional Review Criteria (5 points maximum)
   In addition to the major criteria listed above, certain other factors are given consideration in the review process.

   a. Faculty Early in their Professional Careers or Senior Faculty Developing a New Line of Research
      General Research Funds are modest relative to the amount requested for projects, the number of faculty members, and the volume of applications. There is thus a disposition to fund faculty members in the early years of professional development or senior faculty developing a new line of research.

   b. Pilot Projects
Proposals for pilot projects, which represent the first step toward larger-scale investigations with the potential for external funding, are regarded favorably. An applicant who submits a proposal for a pilot project should state the expected source of the outside funding and the efforts that will be made toward securing such funding.

*Consideration will be given to applications that are submitted concurrently with proposals to outside agencies for funding of the same project.*

c. **Completion of Projects Funded Elsewhere**

If a project was funded elsewhere and requires modest support for its completion or needs funds to match support already provided by the outside grant, it will be given special consideration.

### C. Review Criteria for Behavioral Sciences

1. **Scientific/Scholarly Importance/Significance** (20 points maximum)
   What is the importance of the project or the questions addressed to the proposer’s discipline or the interdisciplinary endeavor? Will the completion of the project lead to significant scholarly publications?

2. **Quality of Research/Methodological Rigor** (20 points maximum)
   Does the research plan reflect adequate knowledge of the relevant literature and represent adequate methodology to address the research objectives?

3. **Applicant’s Previous Record of Scholarly Accomplishments Relative to Seniority** (20 points maximum)
   Given the applicant’s time in the field, does he/she have an adequate record of scholarly accomplishments? Given the accomplishments of the applicant, is there a reasonable likelihood of successful completion of the project? What has been produced by past GRF funding for the applicant?

4. **Potential for Outside Funding** (20 points maximum)
   Is there a reasonable chance (given the constraints of available funding in different areas) of obtaining outside funding? What is the applicant’s history of obtaining outside funding? Has the applicant made attempts to obtain outside funding where such support is available?

5. **Faculty Within 10 Years of Post Ph.D. or Senior Faculty Beginning New Line of Research** (15 points maximum)

6. **Other Relevant Special Considerations** (5 points maximum)
e.g., need for bridging funds between grant periods, joint projects that may lead to large outside funding.

D. Review Criteria for Physical Sciences and Mathematics
1. Significance/scientific merit
2. Research record of applicant
3. Feasibility of proposed project
4. Potential for outside funding
5. The Associate Dean may wish to consult with Department Chairs concerning any aspect of the proposal or with regard to particular issues regarding the PI.
6. Additional Review Criteria
   The primary criterion is the merit of the research proposal. The following factors may also be considered.
   a. A consideration should be given to faculty “in the early years of their professional development who have not previously enjoyed substantial support.”
   b. Individuals are not limited with regard to the frequencies with which they apply for support from the GRF. Renewal of the same project will require special justification and generally is not encouraged.
   c. Multi-investigator proposals are encouraged. However, the proposal should focus on support for one of the investigators. The funds are too limited to spread over an entire group of investigators.
   d. If a proposal from another entity is more appropriately reviewed by one of the departmental GRF committees in the Physical Science Entity and that committee recommends funding, the funds must come from the original entity.

E. Review Criteria for EEB
Successful proposals will meet the following criteria:
1. The proposed research is feasible and will likely lead to an important advance in the research discipline. *Note: this criterion is given exceptional weighting.*
2. The proposed research will likely lead to the submission of a competitive proposal for extramural funding. *Note: this criterion is given exceptional weighting.*
3. Past GRF awards have resulted in publications and funded proposals from extramural agencies. *Note: this criterion is given exceptional weighting.*
4. The proposer has a successful research record.
5. The proposal is clearly written and carefully assembled.
6. Special consideration will be given to faculty members early in their careers.

F. Review Criteria for MB
Successful proposals will meet the following criteria.
1. The proposed research is feasible and likely will yield important results. This
criterion is given exceptional weighting.
2. The proposed research is likely to lead to the submission of a competitive proposal for extramural funding. This criterion is given exceptional weighting.
3. Past GRF awards (when applicable) have resulted in publications and funded proposals from extramural agencies.
4. The investigator has a successful research record.
5. The proposal is clearly written.
6. In cases where applications have similar merit, the relative needs of each lab will be considered when awarding funding.

G. Review Criteria for School of the Arts

1. Significance (40 points Maximum)
   a. What is the importance of the project or of the questions in terms of the applicant’s discipline?
   b. Will the completion of the project lead to significant artistic achievement or scholarly publications?

2. Quality of the Research/Creative Plan (30 points maximum)
   a. Are the objectives clearly stated?
   b. Does the plan reflect adequate knowledge of relevant background and current literature?
   c. Does the plan clearly describe the methods to be used? Is the methodology appropriate to the artistic or research objectives?
   d. Is there a reasonable likelihood of successful completion of the project in the time, budget and facilities indicated?

3. Qualifications of Applicant (30 points maximum)
   a. Given the applicant’s time in the field, does s/he have an adequate record of artistic or scholarly accomplishment?
   b. Has the applicant made attempts to obtain external funding where such support is available?
   c. Has past GRF support resulted in successfully completed projects?

VII. Goals

A. Goals for Social Sciences
   1. Increase number of grants/fellowship proposals submitted and awarded.
   2. Increase the percentage of GRFs that lead to grant/fellowship proposals.
   3. Increase in scholarly publications associated with GRF proposals.

B. Goals for Behavioral Sciences
   1. Increase number of grants/fellowships submitted and awarded.
2. Increase in scholarly publications attributable to GRF proposals.

C. Goals for Humanities
   1. Encourage major new projects for research.
   2. Promote research by junior faculty.
   3. Increase number of successful grant applications.

D. Goals for Physical Sciences and Mathematics
   Support faculty research.
   1. Support graduate student research
   2. Enhance scholarly activity, including publications and presentations.
   3. Increase extramural funding.

E. Goals for Life Sciences (EEB and MB)
   1. Enhance a faculty member’s chances of success in securing extramural funding.
   2. Furthering of research objectives, discovery, funding of graduate students, and resultant publications and presentations at conferences will follow as a result.

F. Goals for MB:
   The goal of the proposals are to increase extramural funding through support of graduate student research. Publications, presentations, and other scholarly activities will follow as a result of this goal.

G. Goals for School of the Arts
   1. Encourage major new projects in the arts
   2. Promote research by junior faculty
   3. Increase the number of external grants/fellowship applications

GRF MATERIALS, PRODUCTS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. Property.
   Title to all materials, equipment, supplies, microfilm, computer files, books, tapes, documents, etc. obtained with GRF funds will rest in the University. When such materials are no longer needed for the project they should be released to either the department or to the University Library for use by other faculty members and students.

2. Acknowledgements and Intellectual Property
   All publications, presentations or performances supported in whole or in part by this allocation should bear the following acknowledgment: "This investigation was supported by the University of Kansas General Research Fund allocation #2301__." If works of art or other products of activity supported by this allocation are to be sold or leased or otherwise yield income, you are expected to consult with
James Baxendale (864-7783), KU Executive Director of Research Institute Affiliate. Intellectual property developed as a result of the General Research Fund is subject to the intellectual property policy of both the University of Kansas and the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR). These policies can be found at:
http://policy.ku.edu/provost/intellectual-property-policy