NARC committee guidelines

Basic principles:

1) Quality and impact of the proposed research must be the highest criterion for the evaluation. Is the proposed project a high quality and impactful project?
2) Also important is the track record of the faculty member regarding producing results, especially when funded via a NARC previously. That is, are there actual accomplishments from prior NARC grants – papers, presentations, software, hardware, etc.? Merely “getting smarter” is typically not sufficient. A priority should be placed on those who have a strong record of accomplishment when given funding.
3) Expect a quality proposal that clearly describes what is to be done.

Do’s

1) Emphasize the quality of proposed work.
2) Emphasize impact of proposed work – is this an important project worthy of funding?
3) Emphasize qualifications of the faculty member and his/her track record of productivity.
4) Demand sufficient details in the proposal – ensure that what is proposed is sufficiently well planned and clearly articulated.
5) Each reviewer should independently assess and evaluate each NARC proposal. Provide those ratings in a tabular format so that the Dean can see the range of evaluations and not simply a final “score.” That is, follow the adapted NSF rating model (see below).

Don’ts

1) Avoid considering the rank of the faculty member (e.g. “Professor X is really senior and we ought to prefer more junior faculty”).
2) Avoid considering quotas per person (e.g. “Professor X has had 2 prior NARC awards, so we ought to recommend this one at a lower priority”)
3) Avoid considering quotas per department or division (e.g. “We need to recommend this NARC proposal since the Department doesn’t have as many awards as other departments”).
4) Avoid bias in favor or against certain kinds of disciplines (e.g. “Work in this discipline is useless, so we should not recommend a NARC award”).
5) Avoid a linear ordered “rack and stack” of the NARCs. Simply provide a matrix of “ratings” for each proposal following this example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Evaluator 1</th>
<th>Evaluator 2</th>
<th>Evaluator 3</th>
<th>Evaluator 4</th>
<th>Evaluator 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adapted NSF Rating Scale

- **Excellent**
  - Great idea
  - Few, if any, flaws
  - Definitely fund

- **Very Good**
  - Good idea
  - Some fixable flaws
  - Fund if possible

- **Good**
  - Reasonably good idea
  - A few important flaws
  - Could be funded, but with some reservation

- **Fair**
  - Some positive aspects
  - Several important flaws or some fatal flaws
  - Recommend not funding

- **Poor**
  - Few positive aspects
  - Many flaws and/or fatal flaws
  - Should not be funded