Guidelines for Drafting the Narrative for a Faculty Research Grant

Length: No more than 1500 words (not including bibliography).

Style: Must be sufficiently specific, detailed and scholarly to satisfy reviewers from within your discipline, but clear, concise and accessible enough to be understood by the majority of reviewers who will be from outside your discipline.

Purpose: To promote your project and to form the initial seed for what we hope will grow into: an external grant or fellowship proposal or advocacy for your completed book’s publication, its reception by your colleagues, and acclaim in your field.

Organize the narrative with the following section headings:

Abstract: One paragraph (<100 words) describing your proposed project, including:
- a clear and concise statement of topic/problem presented
- stage of research to date
- scope of work to be performed
- timeline for execution of entire project, should your FRG be awarded
- expected outcome(s) (e.g., monograph, scholarly article, larger grant or external fellowship application) If expected outcome is to complete a portion of a larger endeavor, please provide a brief explanation of that endeavor and how this FRG project will contribute to it.

Background: Detail how the above described project is related to your own and other individuals’ scholarship in the field. (Reference to your bibliography is appropriate).

Contribution & Method: Explain how the project will advance scholarship in your field as well as any further impact it may have across disciplines and/or in direct application. Consider including:
- research methods and materials;
- past, current or proposed collaborations;
- elaboration of scope and stage of work;
- any form of external support for this project that you have received, applied for, or for which you intend to apply.

Conclusion: Make a concise argument that you will achieve your stated short-term intended outcomes for this project and that those outcomes are critical to your career, your discipline, and to Fordham. Tie this argument to your outcome:
- For an article, reiterate the target journal(s) for the publication(s) and any further presentations or hoped for ramifications;
- For an external fellowship or grant application, please provide the request for proposal (RFP);
- For a book, reiterate whether you already have a contact or identify your targeted/interested publisher(s) and your timeline to completion.

Bibliography: This section is not to be an exhaustive bibliography. Rather, list your own publications that are relevant to this project and the essential titles or materials of other scholars upon whose work you will either build or to which you seek to present alternatives.
Know your Audience:  
How the Faculty Research Grant Narrative will be Reviewed

Office of Research
• on-time and complete application;
• applicant/application eligible under University Statutes and FRG Disbursement Guidelines;
• Summary Report filed from prior Fordham Faculty Research Grants or Fellowships;
• based on number of applications from each discipline, recruits and retains peer reviewers, primarily from prior three years’ of Faculty Fellowship and Faculty Research Grant recipients

Peer Review (reviewers receive applicant materials from Office of Research)
• Minimum of two reviewers per application
  o One reviewer is from applicant’s discipline,
  o Second reviewer may be from a relevant discipline.
  o More than two reviewers may be used to gain multi-disciplinary perspective on interdisciplinary proposal, or to provide additional insight when there is a disparity in initial two reviewers’ recommendations
• Criteria for peer review:
  o Clarity and completeness of the description of the proposed project.
  o Confidence that the applicant will successfully complete project proposed during the grant period.
  o Evaluation of the scope of work the applicant proposes to complete for the 12-month grant period given the current stage of the project.
  o Likelihood and quality of a scholarly outcome, such as external support in the form of a grant or fellowship and/or publication.
  o Adequacy and appropriateness of budgeted items and their stated costs

University Research Council (receives all applicant materials, peer reviews and analyses)
• Considers whether significant disparity in peer review by any academic unit or individual reviewer could have compromised an applicant’s evaluation, and if so, identifies proper redress.
• Based upon the same criteria as peer review, decides as a Council whether to adopt, amend, decide among or alter the recommendation(s) from the peer review process regarding whether to fund, fund with revised budget, or not fund.

Office of Research (receives URC’s recommendations for funding on merits of application)
• If the amount of funding requested by all applicants recommended for funding exceeds the amount of funding available, the Office of Research applies the URC adopted prioritization parameters, which apply a global approach to adhere to the priorities for awarding FRGs listed in the University Statutes (“potential for publication”, “submission to external funding agencies”, “major emphasis on junior faculty”, “first research projects beyond the dissertation”).
• If, after application of the prioritization parameters, the total requested funding still exceeds funding available, the Office of Research applies the minimum across the board percentage reduction of all budgets necessary to match the funding available.