Your Dean or Division Head, in collaboration with OSP and other key parties, will use these strategic factors to guide decision-making about approval to pursue a sponsored program. Note that several factors (factors 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8) are deemed so critical that a low score in any of these will often lead to a denial or tabling of a request to pursue a grant/sponsored program. Some grant opportunities are well-defined, very straightforward, and uncomplicated. A brief review of these strategic factors with your Dean and the Director, OSP may be sufficient to confirm support to pursue the project. Larger, more complex, or more risk-prone projects may require a more formal write-up of the research proposal idea and more formal discussion among key parties in order to receive approval to fully develop the project using University resources. The objectives of using this assessment form are: 1) to assist faculty in early identification of potential barriers to success prior to them investing substantial time on the project; 2) providing insights and advice about possible strategies to increase competitiveness of the project; and 3) provide assurance to OSP that the University supports the project.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** | | |
| **Funding Agency:** | **Proposal Due Date:** | **Funding Amount/Timeframe:** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategic Factors** | **Weighted Criteria: STRATEGIC FACTOR** | | | | | | | | | **Rating**  **(0 - 8)** |
| **LOW** | | | **MEDIUM** | | | **HIGH** | | |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** |
| 1. **Fit:** (with University, mission, strategic plan, strategic priorities)\* | Does not fit or align well | | | Is marginally aligned | | | Well aligned, fits, helps fulfill University mission & strategic priorities | | |  |
| 1. **Principal Investigator Capacity:** (readiness, expertise, support, time necessary to lead the project given other responsibilities)\* | Not prepared to undertake project, and or overloaded with existing demands | | | Marginally prepared to undertake and complete project | | | Well prepared and available to undertake, complete, and leverage project | | |  |
| 1. **Institutional Capacity to Implement:** (time, resources, systems, personnel to ensure successful implementation of project if funded)\* | Little to no capacity to implement project if successful | | | Marginally able to implement project | | | Well prepared to implement project successfully | | |  |
| 1. **Financial Potential:** (analysis of return on investment in terms of time, funding, human resources needed to work on project in light of likelihood of success) | Low projected return on resource investment | | | Moderate projected return on investment | | | High projected return on investment | | |  |
| 1. **Competitive Assessment:** (funding probabilities) | Less than 10% likelihood of funding | | | Between 10% and 50% likelihood of funding | | | Greater than 50% likelihood of funding. | | |  |
| 1. **Readiness to Respond:** (adequate time to gather research, data, resources, and write & secure approvals to submit competitive proposal)\* | Do not have staff time and/or other resources to effectively respond | | | Stresses resources significantly, but able to respond competitively | | | Have staff time and resources to develop competitive proposal | | |  |
| 1. **Project Team Readiness:** (Internal and any external partners, subcontractors or subrecipients)\* | Partners, subcontractors, subrecipients not identified or not capable to contribute to a strong effort | | | No partners needed, partners in minimal role, or partners acceptable, may contribute little | | | All types of partners are identified, on board, and will contribute to enhance project | | |  |
| 1. **University Resources Impact:** (space, personnel, matching funds)\* | Requires significant investment of University resources and may cause hardships | | | Requires moderate investment of University resources | | | Requires minimal investments or investments the University can afford | | |  |
| 1. **Leveraging/Sustainability:** (isolated project or builds on and leverage others and can be sustained) | This is an isolated project that will be difficult to sustain | | | Project has moderate leveraging and sustainability potential | | | Project builds on other projects at the University, is catalytic to achieving strategic goals, and can be institutionalized and sustained | | |  |
| 1. **Funding Agency History:** (contact, history, rapport, success with funder) | University is not known to this agency or staff; no history of success with submitted proposals | | | University is known to this agency and staff; moderate history of success with the funder | | | University is well known and has well-developed working relationships with funder and strong history of success with the agency | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dean or Division Head signature:** | **Approve** | **Deny** | **Date:** |
| **Recommendation/Notes**: | | | |
| **Director, OSP signature:** | **Approve** | **Deny** | **Date:** |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Authorized Organizational Representative signature:** | **Approve** | **Deny** | **Date:** |
| **Notes:** | | | |