

FRA most common constructive criticisms

For each of our internal funding competitions, faculty whose proposals were not funded receive feedback in an effort to help strengthen their future submissions. The following are the most common constructive criticisms for the Faculty Research Award competition over the last two years.

Action plan/Methods

- The committee would have liked to see a clearer description/action plan of the manuscript preparation process.
- The proposal would be strengthened by providing a more specific timeline for the action plan.
- A more detailed timeline/action plan would have helped strengthen the proposal.
- The committee would have liked to see a more developed timeline for the action plan.
- The addition of a detailed action plan for the proposed FRA with a timeline would have further strengthened the application.
- The committee felt that the proposal could be strengthened by the addition of a detailed timeline/action plan for the requested Faculty Research Appointment.
- The addition of a timeline of action steps would have enhanced the action plan section.

Format

- Also, there is a two page limit for curriculum vitae.
- The proposal exceeded the seven page limit.
- Your application did not follow the guidelines for submission (should be 12 pt font, double spaced).
- The application did not meet the required submission criteria of being double spaced.
- Also, curriculum vitae are limited to two pages, the submitted vita was 21 pages.
- The proposal did not meet the submission criteria, it should be double spaced.
- The committee felt you had a very strong proposal, and would encourage you to resubmit the application with the required formatting and double spacing.

Jargon

- The use of jargon is strongly discouraged.
- The committee felt that there was too much jargon in the proposal.
- The proposal should be written for the layperson.
- The committee felt that the terminology in the proposal could have been better defined.
- Also, the proposal should be written for a layperson and avoid the use of jargon.
- The committee thought that the action plan and methods section should be written more clearly, and for a layperson.

Scholarly context/significance

- They also wanted to have the proposed work related to work by others in the field.
- There were questions about how the current project builds on the earlier work of the applicant and its relationship to the work of others.
- The committee felt that the proposed work was not properly situated in the context of other scholarly work in the field.
- They felt that the relationship of the proposed work to the work of others in the field could have been more clearly stated.

Cited References

- The committee felt that the scholarly significance of the proposal could be strengthened by the addition of scholarly context with the use of cited references.
- They felt that the applied significance was strong, but that the argument for scholarly significance would have been strengthened by the addition of references to the work others in the field.
- References cited in the text would have strengthened the proposal.