



**LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO  
INTERNAL RESEARCH AWARDS PROGRAM  
SUMMER RESEARCH STIPEND INFORMATION**

*Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives*

Loyola University Chicago will award summer research stipends, in the amount of \$7,000.00, on a competitive basis to support scholarly faculty activity during the summer. Individual deans are free to augment approved summer stipend awards from school level funding sources, however, all stipends (except those organized within the School of Law) must be vetted by and receive the recommendation of the Faculty Development Review Committee.

**1. Purpose of award**

- The purpose of the award is to help faculty conduct research that will advance their scholarship program. The term 'research' refers to the normal scholarly activity in a discipline: contributing to knowledge in a subject area, or taking a well-defined step toward producing original scientific or artistic work. Summer stipend awards are not intended for course development or for teaching-related work, including the development of textbooks or casebooks. Stipends are not awarded to support work toward an advanced degree.
- If the proposed work is a part of, or closely related to, a larger research project (books, films, productions, or other publishable scholarship), or if it is preliminary work needed to position the applicant for a competitive application for future external funding (fellowships, grants, and other scholarship awards), the applicant should discuss this in the application.

**2. Eligibility and requirements for the award**

- All tenured and tenure-track faculty from the lakeside schools and the Marcella Niehoff School of Nursing are eligible to apply for a summer stipend. Faculty members who receive a summer stipend award must return to their normal duties at Loyola during the academic year following the summer of the award.
- Applicants are required to list all past summer stipend awards. In the event that funds for stipends are limited, and in cases where a proposal is judged ready for funding, the applicant will receive added consideration if she or he has not received a stipend in the past three academic years. Similarly, the application must indicate how the award is necessary and/or important to the success of the project.
- Please note full-time and part-time administrators are not eligible for summer stipends. Department Chairs who will be ending their service in the summer of the proposal are eligible to submit a proposal. Faculty members who receive summer stipends for two consecutive summers are not eligible to apply for an award the following year.

### **3. Submission details and deadline**

- Please consult your school or college to confirm deadlines for any required preliminary steps.

### **4. Proposal Review Procedure**

Proposals will be reviewed and recommended for funding or non-funding by the Faculty Development Review Committee (FDRC). The committee members will review all applications. In addition, each proposal will also be assigned one primary and two secondary reviewers, in accordance with the expertise of FDRC members in a given year. These assignments are usually made by the chairperson of the FDRC.

The reviewers will assess the applications on each of the following categories: (rubric attached)

- a. This proposal effectively explains the significance of the proposed work; shows promise of attaining goals of value to the relevant discipline; shows how the work will significantly advance the field;
- b. This proposal demonstrates that the applicant has a grasp of the field and of the associated literature;
- c. This proposal outlines methods or approaches to the proposed work in a way that convinces the reviewer that the objectives of the project will be achieved;
- d. This proposal is written clearly and in a manner that can be evaluated by faculty peers for its scholarship quality;
- e. This proposal makes clear that the applicant has the expertise to carry out the project and that the applicant's research program will be advanced by this award;
- f. This proposal makes clear the extent to which the summer stipend is important to the completion of the project.
- g. This proposal outlines the plan for disseminating the results of this project.

Having considered all of these criteria, the Faculty Development Review Committee members will rate the proposal on a five point scale where five indicates "exceptionally ready for funding," three indicates "ready for funding," and scores below three indicate that the proposal is judged "not ready for university funding."

## **5. Clearances**

Applicants are reminded that all projects involving human subjects, biohazards, radiation, or the use of live vertebrate animals require approval by the appropriate oversight committee before they can begin. Please contact The Office of Research Services for further assistance with this process.

## **6. Final Report**

Successful applicants will be required to submit a single-page report to the University FDR Committee by Dec 15<sup>th</sup> following the summer research. External funding proposals that result from summer research stipends can serve to satisfy this requirement.

## **7. External Applications**

When appropriate, applicants are encouraged to submit identical or complementary proposals to external funding agencies.

### Summer Research Stipend Proposal Rubric

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