**I. The purpose of the program**:

The Intramural Grants Program (IGP) is a comprehensive and coordinated competitive grant program that is committed to the advancement of knowledge through basic and applied research, to the enrichment of society through creative initiatives, to promoting faculty research in all disciplines, and to recognizing that scholarly activity can take different forms across disciplines. It is designed to support faculty in becoming competitive in securing external funding and sponsorship. Supported projects are expected to result in appropriate scholarly products that will increase the national and international recognition of the awardees, their programs, and the university.

IGP funding is to be viewed as a source of funds to help faculty remain engaged in their disciplines and contribute new knowledge through programs of scholarship. Funding from the program is intended to provide additional internal resources to help faculty pursue a broader array of professional activities, including the initiation, stimulation or partial funding of a research project. Funding is not intended to be an ongoing source of funding for faculty research and scholarship projects.

**II. Principal Investigator Terminology**:

Auburn University encourages multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary collaborations and places accountability and responsibility for the research project on the Principal Investigator (PI).

To avoid confusion of terminology, the IGP uses the term PI strictly for the individual who bears primary responsibility for technical compliance, completion of programmatic work, fiscal stewardship of sponsor funds, and compliance with administrative requirements of the project. All other investigators on an application will be regarded as co-investigators (Co-Is). The term Co-PI will not be used for the IGP, with the exception of an extreme situation in which two applicants on one proposal share absolutely equal responsibilities. In this case, the term Co-PI can be used to describe both investigators; both Co-PIs will be subject to the PI eligibility criteria and must provide a description of how joint administration of the project will work.

The PI must meet the following general eligibility criteria as well as criteria specific to each of the IGP grant categories. These requirements do not apply to Co-Is.

**For all grant categories**: Unless otherwise noted, PI eligibility follows the institutional requirements set forth in the [University’s Statement of Principal Investigator Eligibility](https://cws.auburn.edu/shared/files?id=159&filename=eligibility.pdf). Each eligible applicant may submit two applications in a year, providing one is an application for a “Good to Great” grant. Funding for all IGP grants is for a two - year period.

**III. The Proposal Scoring Process**

Fundamentally, we begin with a premise or assumption that scholarship is work that advances knowledge.  Scholarly activity could involve the collection of original data (through interviews, surveys or other methods); the production of new knowledge, or could involve undertaking empirical or theoretical investigation; the analysis of data; reviewing, analyzing, and/or translating/interpreting original texts or objects of art or antiquity; creation of an original work; or innovative applications of design and technology. While final products might vary, in the broadest sense a proposal for funding needs to be clear to reviewers both within and outside the discipline. Keep in mind the following as you write your proposal:

* **Craft a statement of significance/impact:** Is there a creative opportunity or a gap in the literature, or an unanswered research question. Frame the topic to convey its importance, or urgency and its impact.
* **Describe your approach to the work:** Describe how you are qualified to conduct the work and why your approach is appropriate. If your work involves travel, explain why it is critical to your endeavor.
* **Discuss the outcomes of the work:** Demonstrates action toward a peer reviewed or juried product appropriate to the field - for example: a published article, book chapter, or book; a conference presentation and article; a performance and/or recording of the presented work; a finished result of creative work and gallery, museum, or professional presentation.
* Applicants should keep in mind that members of the Peer Review Panel represent a variety of disciplines from across the university. Therefore, applicants must write their proposals without excessive jargon and in a style that is clear to reviewers who are not experts in the specified area.
* **The proposal scoring process** :
* Each proposal is assigned three reviewers. Proposals are scored 1-5 (with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest score) based on each of the following criteria:
	+ - 1. Approach – Is the methodology appropriate to answer the question or perform the study/project being proposed?
		- 2. Significance and Broader Impact – Has the applicant(s) described how the project contributes to advancing the field and its relevance to the public.
		- 3. Pathway(s) to extramural funding – Has the applicant(s) described a clear plan, including funding agencies, review panels and potential requests for proposals to achieve extramural funding for work that will follow this proposal and that is based on this proposal?
		- 4. Innovation/Creativity – Is the proposed work innovative and/or creative? Will it have a discernable impact?
		- 5. For Good to Great proposals – Is the proposal responsive to the external reviewer(s) questions/comments? Note that this may mean that the applicant(s) refute some of the reviewer’s comments with appropriate evidence and citations, but the applicant is also expected to clearly explain how the current proposal will answer the concerns posed by the external review.
	+ Reviewers also rate the proposal as “acceptable” or “unacceptable” for the following points:
		- 6. Qualifications of the investigative team – Is the team that has been assembled qualified to perform the proposed project?
		- 7. Environment – Does the applicant(s) have access to the necessary facilities and equipment to perform the proposed project?
		- 8. Appropriateness of budget – Is the budget appropriate, too high or too low to do the project?
		- 9. Grantsmanship – Is the proposal put together in a way that makes it easy to understand and review? Note that this category has been added in recognition that the IGP is an opportunity for Auburn University investigators to sharpen the skills necessary for success in extramural funding and this feedback is designed to assist with that process.
			* (It is noted that the InfoReady system will not accept an acceptable/unacceptable designation but rather requires a number assignation. Therefore unacceptable is assigned a rating of “0”; acceptable is assigned a rating of “1”. These numbers are qualitative in nature and are not used in any quantitative mathematical analysis of the reviewer scores.)
* Reviewers provide comments as well as scores for all of the points above.
* As a last question, each reviewer will be asked to assign a rating of Fund or Do Not Fund to each proposal.
	+ (It is noted that the InfoReady system will not accept a Fund / Do Not Fund designation but rather requires a number assignation. Therefore, Do Not Fund is assigned a rating of “0”; Fund is assigned a rating of “1”. These numbers are qualitative in nature and are not used in any quantitative mathematical analysis of the reviewer scores.)

**IV.** **Grant Categories**

* The IGP focuses on enhancing the reputation of Auburn University and leveraging extramural funding. It is composed of four types of grants:

 Early Career Development Grant

 Cyber Research Grant\*

 Interdisciplinary Team Research Grant

 Good to Great Grant

\* Offered with additional funding in conjunction with the IGP.