PRESIDENTAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT GRANT (PRDG)

Purpose: Rocky Vista University encourages and supports research and will fund several faculty research projects on an annual basis. This internal grant program will provide a limited number of funding awards to full-time RVU faculty to advance selected research projects in order to be nationally competitive for external funding.

Eligibility:

- Only full time faculty members (> 0.75 FTE) at RVU can apply and serve as a Principal Investigator (PI).
- The role and contribution of Co-PIs must be clearly defined in the Project Plan Section and Budget Justification of the Proposal. Multidisciplinary projects and CO-PIs are highly encouraged.
- The application must concisely and convincingly demonstrate that the project: 1) represents a new research direction for the PI building upon established preliminary results from the PI's prior research or publically available data, and 2) will be well-positioned to attain external grant support after the completion of proposed project in application.
- Investigators that have received PRDG funds for a previous application may *not* receive additional PRDG funds for the same or a closely related idea.
- Faculty may only submit one proposal as the PI per funding cycle, but may be a Co-PI on more than one submission.
- Investigators may only receive 1 PRDG grant per fiscal year as the PI and may not receive back to back awards as a PI.
- The proposal *must not* overlap with any existing sponsored projects. Projects for which a pending external proposal on the same or a closely related project is pending are *not* eligible for PRDG funds until after a decision of non-funding has been reached by the external agency, and the PI can demonstrate that addressing external critiques will require additional data that can be acquired with the PRDG funds.
- Investigators who have not submitted an application for external funding after receiving and completing a project supported by PRDG funds are not eligible to apply for PRDG funds again for 2 years or until an external application is submitted.
- PRDG awardees must agree to serve as an internal grant reviewer for either the PRDG or Internal Seed Grant program within 2 years after receiving their award.

Submission, Review, and Selection Process:

- For 2022, applications are due by June 1 with funding decisions to be made by August 1. For subsequent years, applications are due by May 1 with funding decisions to be made by July 1. All PRDG funds must be spent between July 1-June 30 of the year in which the award was received (i.e., within a single fiscal year). NO EXTENSIONS will be granted.
- Consideration for funding will be given based on three applicant pools: 1) projects in the biomedical and health sciences (including OMM/OPP), 2) projects in humanities and social sciences (including psychology, policy, etc.), and 3) education project.
- Applications must have an external funding strategy, including identifying potential extramural funding sources along with sponsor deadline as well as outlining the next phase of the project if the current PRDG proposal is successful or not.
- Applications will be reviewed by a minimum of 3 faculty member PRDG selection committee with appropriate expertise to the applicant pool identified. Committee members cannot apply for a grant either as a PI or Co-PI in the same cycle in which they will review. Committee members will be selected from previous internal grant program awardees (from any program) preferentially, but if none with appropriate expertise are available then

reviewers will be selected from the faculty body at large. All PRDG reviewers will be appointed by the president on recommendation of the Director of Research and Scholarly Activity.

- Each PRDG selection committee will provide recommendations to the president.

Funding:

- Applicants can request up to $30,000 for the project. Regardless of the amount requested all budget requests should be fully justified. Budgets are subject to revision based on the availability of funds and as part of the review and award process.
- Applications may not include faculty salary support; however, they must identify the level of faculty effort committed to the project and may request ½ day per week of protected research time for the PI and Co-PIs.
- Applications generally may not include capital equipment; however, exceptions may be made if it is essential for completing the project. If capital equipment is needed for the project, please contact the director of research prior to submitting the proposed budget.
- Applications may include support for materials, supplies, publications, other professional services, participant costs.
- Support for travel and consultants will not generally be approved without significant justification of how other available mechanisms for such expenses are not available or sufficient.

Application Preparation instructions:

- Cover page (see the template):
- **Research Project and Funding Plan description** (4 pages max)
    - Project abstract (250 words)
    - Summary of the relevant literature
    - Presentation of the PIs preliminary data
    - Research plan
        - Specific Aims
        - Significance
        - Impact of the proposed project
        - Scientific premise of the proposed project
        - Approach that builds upon the PIs existing research data
        - Justification of subject numbers (power analysis as appropriate)
        - Plan for data handling and analyses
        - Description of potential pitfalls and alternative approaches
    - Role of each investigator if there are Co-PIs
- References (limit to 1 page): Include complete references (AMA style)
- Biosketch for PI and all Co-PIs: NIH style biosketch (limit to 2 pages for each investigator)
- Facilities and equipment (limit 1 page): Describe any RVU facilities and equipment that will be used to carry out the work.
- Budget (limit 1 page): Provide a table that details all costs by major budget categories as outlined above in the allowable expenses.
- Budget Justification (limit 1 page): All items including personal time must be fully justified and connected to specific aims of the proposal.

Scoring rubric:

Criterion	4 (Exemplary)	3 (Adequate)	2 (Needs Improvement)	1 (Insufficient evidence)	0 (Unacceptable)	Weight	Total
Significance/ Justification	Strong, clear significance of the proposed problem and clear connection between the significant problem and the proposal	Strong, clear significance of the proposed problem but the connection between the significant problem and the proposal is unclear	Mild significance of the proposed project	Limited significance of the proposed project with no clear justification of how the project will address the significance	No clear significance or justification for the proposal	1	
Scientific Premise	Strong body of literature and preliminary data that supports the objectives of the current study.	Strong body of literature supports the premise. Preliminary data is only peripherally related to the project.	There are unrecognized flaws in the literature cited as the premise for the project.	Literature support for the project is not strong and no preliminary data is not provided.	Premise is not clear and no preliminary data that directly supports the project is provided	1	
Innovation	Project describes new ideas, with broad potential benefits made clear.	Project describes utilizing known concepts/techniques in a new way, with potential benefits made clear but somewhat more localized.	Project represents only an incremental change/advancement over current practices, potential benefit made clear.	Project represents practices/techniques commonplace within the field or implementation of a change with well-established benefits. Or Project is substantially similar to another funded project.	Project repeats what others have done and does not create substantially new knowledge.	1	
Experimental Design/Rigor	Experiments are well laid out with controls clearly identified, statistics discussed, and potential pitfalls and alternative plans defined	Experiments are generally laid out well with controls clearly identified and statistics discussed. No specific pitfalls and alternative plans are included	Experiments are generally laid out well but controls are not well-identified. No discussion of statistics or downstream analyses. The techniques to be used are identified but not well described.	Literature support for the techniques proposed is not strong and no preliminary data is present. No thought provided for downstream analyses.	Experimental plan is laid out in broad strokes with no specific detail. No potential pitfalls or alternatives are identified.	1.5	
Feasibility	A clear and realistic timeline for data acquisition and funding sustainability is provided. Preliminary data of the same kind is provided to demonstrate feasibility	A clear and realistic timeline for data acquisition and funding sustainability is provided. Knowledgeable individuals responsible for data acquisition are not identified.	No clear timeline is presented and/or the individuals responsible for completing the work are not identified.	Equipment for the techniques is not readily available and there is no discussion about how to get access/acquire it.	Equipment is not immediately available and there is no discussion of how to access/acquire it. Personal are not qualified to do the work.	1	
Collaboration	Project includes investigators from multiple RVU campuses, multiple departments, and multiple programs	Project includes investigators from multiple RVU departments and programs	Project includes investigators from other institutions	Project includes investigators from multiple RVU departments and/or programs	Not a collaborative project	1.5	
Results from Previous Funding (Do not score if	Grant submitted with preliminary data from previously funded	Publication from data acquired with previous funding. Presentation of	Results presented as a poster at a local or regional conference.	Preliminary results but no peer-reviewed products	No results	1	

Approved by Leadership Council 04/26/22

no previous funding was provided)	proposal. Publication from data acquired with previous funding	data at a regional, national conference.				
Future funding plan	Fully developed with a timeline and specific programs	Programs are identified but there is no timeline for submission	Timeline is developed but programs are not identified	Organizations are identified but specific programs and timelines are not	No plan is proposed	1.5
Total Score						
Recommend Funding?	Yes	Partial $_____	Not at this time			
Additional Comments:						

Proposal Submission:

All materials should be submitted as a single pdf on iNet.

Please use the following naming format for pdf files:

- PI LastName_PI First Name_PRDG_Year_Proposal Pool (i.e., BHS – Biomedical Heath Science, OPP, OMM, HUM – Humanities or social sciences, ED- education)