

Preparing a Successful Application for the Faculty Opportunity Awards (FOA) Program

The Division of Research offers the following tips to assist faculty as they apply for the Faculty Opportunity Awards.

Applicants should carefully review all instructions, qualifications, and application package requirements. Be sure to include and/or address each item requested. The application package should include the following documents in this order:

1. Cover Page
2. Table of contents
3. Project summary
4. Project narrative
5. Timeline for activities and deliverables
6. Budget plan
7. List of team members, roles, and biosketch
8. Curriculum vitae
9. Current and pending support for both PI and Co-PI
10. Letter of support
11. Three UNLV potential reviewers

All documents should be combined into one PDF application package prior to submission. This enables you to order documents appropriately and reduce the likelihood of errors. It also streamlines reviewers' efforts to identify each component of the application.

- Please use the following format for the file name:

2024 FOA – First Last.pdf

For guidance on the appearance of these documents and for templates, please review the award's webpage.

Components of the Application

Project Summary

The 1-page project summary provides an accurate description of the proposed work. Include a project title, interdisciplinary team members, executive summary, intellectual merit, broader impact and the responsiveness of the proposed research to this FOA.

Project Narrative

The project narrative is limited to 5-pages. The intent of the FOA awards is to provide resources for **team building** and to plan for specified federal, philanthropic, and industry **funding proposals** by the end of the 24-month FOA award.

The primary research deliverable from a FOA award is the **submission of two or more grant proposals** for research funding from external sources, including corporate sponsored research, within the 24-month project performance period. Clearly address how this deliverable will be achieved.

The proposal should help to catalyze a funded research program for new and existing faculty and stimulate development of new research funding opportunities. Ideally, the team would describe a grant making/funding trajectory that is appropriate for the nature of the work and the state of the team. Other planned outcomes, such as manuscripts or creative works, should be included as secondary deliverables if appropriate.

Review Criteria

Applications will be reviewed on the following criteria:

- Overall **quality** of the proposal and its relevance to the program's goals. (25 max points)
- **Clarity** of the project's goals, activities in the service of those goals, deliverables and the reasonableness of the proposed timeline. (25 max points)
- **Likelihood** of success garnering subsequent external support. Submission of two or more grant proposals for research funding from external sources, including corporate sponsored research, within the 24-month project performance period is required. Each application should clearly identify the funding agencies or sources that will be targeted with the research results obtained during the FOA. When possible, the actual funding

opportunities should be provided if it is based on a recurring call for proposals. (20 max points)

- Cost-effective and well-justified **budget** that clearly and directly supports the project. How well are the future funding goals/sources defined and accomplished based on the proposal? Does the project discuss how the funds will be utilized to build the collaborative efforts described in the proposal? (20 max points)
- Is there a plan for intentional **inclusion** of diverse voices, perspectives, positions, and backgrounds on the team? (10 max points)

Timeline

Include a 1-pg timeline that provides a breakdown of the major activities and deliverables for the 24-month period of performance. Highlight the main tasks the team will focus on during each term and provide a clear timeline for the project's progress.

Budget Plan

Include a 2-pg cost-effective and well-justified budget and narrative that clearly and directly supports the project. Use the guidelines below for budget categories. In the budget justification, include enough detail that a reviewer would know how the funding would be utilized. Do not include unallowable budget items. If those unallowable budget items are included, your application may be rejected or funded at a lower amount than proposed.

Budget Categories

1. Salaries and Wages
 - a. Non-faculty LOA
 - b. Hourly Student Wages
2. Fringe Benefits
3. Travel (domestic only)
4. Operating Costs
 - a. Materials & Supplies
 - b. Consultant Services
 - c. Service Fees
5. Other Costs

Team Members, Roles, and Biosketch

Provide a list of team members and their roles. Include a biosketch for the PI and Co-PI(s). Since both NIH and NSF now require the use of [SciENCv](#) to prepare a biosketch, this format is recommended.

Curriculum Vitae

Include a Curriculum Vitae (CV) for the PI and Co-PI(s). The CV is limited to 2 pages, or the length specified by a potential future funding agency (e.g., four pages maximum for NIH).

Current and Pending Support

Current and pending support is required for the PI and Co-PI(s). Since both NIH and NSF now require the use of [SciENCv](#) to prepare the current and pending support, this format is recommended.

Letter of Support

- Nominees must submit at least one letter of support. If proposing use of facilities or equipment not owned by proposers' letter needs to come from Dean. Support of any form should also be documents in the letters. Letters should appear on campus letterhead, use one-inch margins, and be addressed as follows:

TO: Selection Committee, Faculty Opportunity Award

FROM: Name of letter writer and title

DATE: Date when the nomination letter was composed (Month Day, Year)

RE: Letter of Support for (nominee name) - Regents' Researcher Award

Potential Reviewers

Names and emails of three internal to UNLV experts in the PI or Co-PI(s) research field who could serve as potential reviewers. Please do not include those who may have a conflict of interest.