Institutional proposals are proposals submitted by Florida A&M University to a funding sponsor that limits the number of proposals the sponsor will receive by any one institution. When the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) is made aware of institutional proposals, the OSP web page will be updated with information specific to the proposal, such as the proposal’s due date and the number of proposals the sponsor will accept. The information will also be sent in an e-mail to all faculty. The Division of Research’s web page is http://research.famu.edu.

Any faculty member who is interested in responding to a Request For Proposal (RFP) should immediately complete the “Intent to Submit” form on the OSP webpage and send a white paper (one page) to the Vice President for Research within the time specified.

The white paper for institutional proposals must include the following information:

- A statement regarding the ability of the proposed Principal Investigator and each member of the project team to successfully secure and complete the project;
- A description of project team’s track record with the Division of Research in securing and managing grants;
- An indication of whether the proposal requires institutional costs, such as cash or in-kind match (If so, identify the funding source.);
- A description of how the project will benefit FAMU; and
- The goals and objectives of the project (Link these to the RFP.)
- A description of the project’s planned collaborative effort.

The PI should send this information to OSP at least 30 days before the proposal is due, if possible. However, if the OSP finds that the proposal is due within a short time-frame, the Vice President for Research will decide which proposal to submit to the sponsor.

If the number of white papers received by OSP is greater than the number of proposals allowed by the funding sponsor, the Vice President for Research will convene an Ad Hoc Subcommittee of the Faculty Research Advisory Committee (FRAC). The Vice President for Research will appoint members to the Ad Hoc Subcommittee according to the scope of the RFP. The subcommittee will review the white papers and make recommendations to the Vice President for Research on which proposals to submit for funding.

The following evaluation criteria will be used by subcommittee members to assist in evaluating institutional proposal white papers.

Within five days after the white papers are reviewed and evaluated, the PIs will be informed in writing by the Vice President for Research as to which white paper(s) was/were selected to be submitted to the funding sponsor.
# Evaluation Criteria for Institutional Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Do the PI and project team’s qualifications and performance with funding agencies indicate the ability to secure and complete the project?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Does the project team have a positive track record with the Division of Research in securing and managing grants?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> If the proposal requires institutional cost, such as cash or in-kind match, is the funding source clearly identified and realistically available?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Is it sufficiently clear how the project will benefit FAMU?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Are the goals and objectives of the project clearly stated and linked to the RFP?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Rate the extent to which the project includes a planned collaborative effort.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Scale: 5=highest & 1=lowest)

**Comments:** (Reviewers are encouraged to provide relevant comments in support of rating.)

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

**Date of Review:** _____________________________

**Solicitation Information:** _____________________________

**Reviewer’s Name:** _____________________________

**Total Points Awarded:** ________________

**Reviewer’s Signature:** _____________________________