

GRFC Guidelines Comparison Grid

Topic	Current Guidelines	Proposed Guidelines	Comments
Philosophy	Page 3	Page 2	No changes
Eligibility of Proposals	Page 4	Page 3	Eligible projects statement #1 was shorten.
Eligibility of Personnel	Page 4	Page 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of ineligible personnel was removed. Seemed redundant. • Removed rule based on number of previous GRFC proposals. This rules was challenging to enforce. • Added rule limiting PIs to a maximum of 2 open grants. Similar reasoning as the current rule of 4 in the guidelines. We want to encourage faculty to seek outside funding. We also want to be able to support more faculty members. In the proposal, this rule is waived for 3rd or summer calls. • Added a limitation for a maximum of 1 proposal per PI for an individual call.
Amounts Awarded	Page 5	Page 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changed “average” award amount of \$2500 to a “maximum” award amount of \$4000. The true average amount awarded over the last 3 years was much higher than the \$2500 listed. We didn’t rule out providing more than \$4000 for a project, we just state that anything over \$4000 needs extreme justification.
Property	Page 5	Page 4	Updated by removing reference to tapes and microfilm (both still fit under “etc.”).

Part 1: Patents and Copyrights	Page 6	Page 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Now references policy only. Policy was removed from the back of the guidelines. The GRFC guidelines would need to be updated with each patent/copyright policy change. Since the current guidelines include an outdated policy, it seems easier to just send PIs to the university policy. • Removed statement about repaying funds. Whether or not funds need to be repaid to the university should be in the patent/copyright policy and not in the guidelines.
Role of Director of Grant Development	Page 6	Page 4	No changes
Deadlines for Submitting Proposals	Page 7	Page 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Format information is now has a separate section on page 9. Reduced the need to repeat the same information twice. • Fall and Spring Deadline information shorted. • Submission is now listed as to the Moodle or Submissions Website. Allows for updating of the submission procedure without re-writing the guidelines.
Term of Award	Page 7	Page 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated guidelines by updating the example year
Extensions	Page 8	Page 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extension request should now go to the Moodle page or submission website. Easier to deal with than requests by email.
Submission of a Final Report "Deadline"	Page 8	Page 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved to top of Final Report section. Keeps all of the final report information in one place.

Human/Animal Subjects	Page 8	Page 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved to proposal description. • Updated language to match current university procedures.
Hazardous Materials and Lab Safety	Page 9	Page 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved to proposal description. • Updated language to match current university procedures.
Style of the Proposal	Page 10	Page 5	Minor changes only to match updated formatting of the proposed guidelines.
Preliminary Review	Page 10	Page 5	No changes
Section One, TITLE PAGE	Page 10	Page 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor language changes • Note added about needing time to gather all signatures
Section Two, PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Page 10 - 11	Page 5- 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial changes to the requested proposal format. The current format is geared strongly forward scientific research. The proposed new format is much more general and should allow for other types of research and creative projects more easily. • Maximum length of proposals shortened from 9 pages to 5 pages. <p>Proposed format includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of proposal • Project Design and Methods • Expected results and dissemination plan • Description of other funding sources • Sections for Animal/Human Subject or Hazardous Materials as needed.

<p>Section Three BUDGET SUMMARY</p>	<p>Page 12</p>	<p>Page 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor language changes to items 1-4 • Removed request for items to be prioritized. While this sounds like a good idea, the committee finds partially funding proposals challenging. We don't know if the project could work without some of the requested items. And, if the project can work without some of the requested items, then why are they being request. • New statements says that only priority items should be included.
<p>Section Four BUDGET JUSTIFICATION PAGE</p>	<p>Page 12</p>	<p>Page 6 - 7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section has been expanded. Several of the current committee members have sat of the committee for 3 years. We tried to include the justification needed for us to evaluate the budget items well.
<p>Section Five BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH</p>	<p>Page 12 - 13</p>	<p>Page 7</p>	<p>Minor language changes only.</p>
<p>Allowable Budget Items</p>	<p>Page 13</p>	<p>Page 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section has been condensed. Some of the information was moved to the justification section. The original section seemed to confuse some faculty members as we were commonly told that the GRFC didn't fund things listed in the section.

Budget Items That Cannot Be Funded	Page 13 - 14	No longer an individual section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Now listed as a note under allowable items. • Removed restriction for travel to conferences. • Travel must be well justified (see budget justification section) • Also, added travel to dissemination awards (old publication awards). Travel has the same dollar amount restrictions as publications. • Any travel for dissemination purposes, must explain why the funds are needed and if PD funds are also being used.
Accounting Procedures	Page 14	Page 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor changes to allow for a designated budget authority. • The PI, chair and controller's office must approve the budget authority. This is an attempt to deal with overspending on the GRFC accounts. Allowing for a budget authority is in line with other grant programs on campus.
General Evaluation Criteria	Page 15	Page 10	Minor language changes only
Specific Evaluation Criteria	Page 15 - 16	Page 10 - 12	Updated for the new proposed format.
Reasons for Rejection of Proposals	Page 16 - 17	Page 12	No changes
History of guidelines	Page 17	Page 15	Added section heading. No changes to content. Have there been any guideline changes since 2001?

PUBLICATION CHARGES	Page 18-19	Page 16 – 17	Name changed to Dissemination Proposals. Proposal includes increasing the types of dissemination for which faculty can request funding.
Submission Period of Publication Charge Proposals:	Page 18	Page 16	No changes
Evaluation of Proposals: (Publication charges)	Page 18	Page 16	No longer a separate section. Information included in the application procedure.
Application Procedures/Materials: (Publication charges)	Page 18	Page 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title page appendix number updated. • “Evidence of dissemination” added as part of the application. • Added language to allow for evidence of creative works • “Justification” added as section of application.
Follow-Up Requirements: (Publication charges)	Page 19	Page 16	No changes.
Percentage of the GRFC Budget to be "Safeguarded" (Publication charges)	Page 19	Page 16	Heading changed. No content changes.
Policy Regarding Reprints (Publication charges)	Page 19	Page 16	No changes
Special Considerations: (Publication charges)	Page 19	Page 17	No changes

History of guidelines (Publication charges)	Page 19	Page 17	No changes
PATENTS AND COPYRIGHTS POLICY	Page 20	Removed	The policy was out dated. The guidelines reference the University policy. The committee feels that the GRFC guidelines should point faculty to the University policy. Having an out dated policy included could cause confusion.
New in proposal		Page 21	Appendix 3. Final Report Budget Form.