



Cal Poly Internal Funding

Proposal Development Program

Deadline: Thursday, October 8, 2026 @ NOON PDT

Synopsis of the Program

Extramural grant funding facilitates faculty engagement in research, scholarly and creative activities by supporting direct project costs, faculty compensation and release time, student research fellowships and other related expenses, while advancing our commitment to the teacher-scholar model. Faculty at primarily undergraduate institutions must balance competing demands with relatively high teaching loads. Faculty consistently report time constraints as a barrier to their ongoing engagement in deep and meaningful scholarly pursuits. The Proposal Development Track is intended to support the teacher-scholar model by providing up to 3 WTUs of assigned time, along with specific proposal revision guidance from the Hanover Research group, to support the revision and resubmission of one externally funded research proposal. Statistics indicate that incorporating feedback from grant consultants increases the odds of success when applying for external funding. If selected for this opportunity, your materials will be shared with Hanover to initiate this process. Upon award notification, in preparation for proposal submission through the relevant Office of Research pre-award office, participants should submit the [Pre-Award Proposal Initiation Form](#) in my Cal Poly Research, found in the Cal Poly Portal. Awards made through this program must result in a revised proposal submission to an external sponsor that allows public dissemination of knowledge produced and allows for a minimum of 15% F&A to be included in the sponsor budget with the expectation that Cal Poly's full F&A rate of 38.5% is used whenever allowed by the sponsor. Awardees who fail to meet the expectations of this program jeopardize their eligibility for funding from future internal award programs. Proposal revisions are expected to be re-submitted to the external sponsor by June 30, 2028. If this deadline is not met, individuals will not be eligible for future internal grant funding from the Office of Research. Proposals should be of high intellectual merit, appropriate to the identified funding mechanism, in support of Cal Poly's teacher scholar approach, and ideally, though not required, include student involvement. It is incumbent upon the applicant to make these elements clear in their application. All funds awarded must be used for specific approved purposes and may not be converted to other uses without authorization by the Office of Research and the Office of the Associate Vice Provost.

Funding Details

Each track of the Internal Funding program has its own budget restrictions. *Carefully review the appropriate info sheet and ensure that the budget submitted meets the stated requirements.* **Failure to submit an appropriate budget will result in your proposal being returned without review.**



- Proposal Development: The budget requests may not exceed 3 WTU's. Assigned time must be taken throughout AY 27-28. The WTUs are intended to be awarded only to the applicant. In the case of collaborative projects, awardees may request support to be divided among no more than two applicants.
- Requests to convert WTUs to additional compensation may also be considered if the request directly supports the timeline for submission

Additional Eligibility Requirements

In addition to the eligibility requirements as stated on the Internal Funding Program RFP, the following criteria are applied towards the Proposal Development Track:

- To be eligible to apply, applicants must be faculty (unit 3) employees (i.e. tenure-track, tenured, or lecturer faculty). Non-faculty unit employees (i.e. MPP, staff, etc.) are not eligible.
- Proposal was declined since July 1, 2022
- Proposal was submitted to a federal, state, or nonprofit sponsor
- Proposal was submitted to a sponsor that allows public dissemination of knowledge produced
- Proposal was submitted to a sponsor that allows a minimum of 15% Facilities and Administrative costs (F&A) included in the sponsor budget
- Recognition that, if selected, materials will be shared with the Hanover Research Group to initiate the proposal review/feedback process

Proposal Submission

- Proposals are due Thursday, October 8, 2026 @ NOON PDT. **No late submissions will be accepted.** Applicants are strongly encouraged to submit their proposals early. (Standard practice is 24 hours ahead of deadline).
- From the InfoReady homepage, select "Log In" in the upper right-hand corner, and click on the blue "Cal Poly San Luis Obispo Login" button. Use your Cal Poly credentials to log in. Then click on the 2027-2028 Proposal Development Program link. You will then be able to submit an application. Please remember that you will apply by entering data into InfoReady text fields as described above (rather than a single PDF proposal).
- If you have questions regarding this request for proposals, contact research@calpoly.edu. You may also visit our website.

Application Requirements

The proposal should be written for reviewers who are not experts in the applicant's specific field. It is incumbent upon the applicant to write their proposal so that their non-disciplinary colleagues can judge the merit of their proposals. Proposals will be submitted through InfoReady. See "Proposal



Submission” below for how to access InfoReady. Please refer to the InfoReady template for all application fields. Please note, sections have maximum word limits. We have provided instructions for key aspects of the application below:

- **Proposal Abstract/Narrative** (1000-word limit): Project Narrative should include introduction to project, background, project scope, relevance, and revision plan
- **Project revision and resubmission timeline** (250-word limit): The grant period will be July 1, 2027 to June 30, 2028. Outline a schedule of the revision and resubmission timeline
- **Budget Justification** (250-word limit). Please provide brief justification for funding request (e.g., assigned time for revision timeline)
- A copy of the declined proposal (including all submitted documents, appendices, and references)
- A copy of review comments from sponsor
- Pre-Award proposal number
- A list of agencies and programs targeted for resubmission with known or expected deadlines
- **Curriculum Vitae:** Provide a current curriculum vitae for the PI. Use NSF biographical sketch style from Science CV, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sciencv/> Please direct any ScienCV questions to the NIH Help Desk: NLMSciencv@mail.nih.gov
- **Citations & Other Grant Support:**
 - Citations or references.
 - List of former, current, or pending support for this or related work, the sources and amount awarded, scholarly products resulting from the support. If you have been previously supported by a Cal Poly Internal Funding Program (RSCA and/or TSMG), results and outcomes must be described.*Only one document is allowed to be uploaded in this section. Please combine into one PDF or Word document.

Review Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated based on the revision plan, the potential for funding, the intellectual merit and broad impacts of the project under revision. To ensure proposals are equitably reviewed, the committee uses a review model based on full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty across the six colleges, ensuring proposals are reviewed against other proposals in the same college. Each proposal is reviewed by three reviewers from the Academic Senate Grants Review Panel, with one reviewer from the PI’s college.



Please note that the Cal Poly Internal Funding Program is highly competitive due to funding limitations, and it is possible that high quality proposals will not be funded. In accordance with external funding agencies, such as NSF, NIH, PRF, DoD, DOE and others, any use of AI should be readily disclosed in the proposal. Original writing takes precedence and offers maximum value to a reviewer. Proposals and topics found to have content or sections substantially developed by AI will be subject to reduced scores and in some cases will be returned without review. All PIs agree to have their proposals evaluated by AI review programs to be deemed eligible for funding. Submission of your proposal to the Internal Funding program constitutes permission to submit your proposal to AI review programs.

Proposal Development Rating Definitions

Revision Plan (5 pts)

- Does the revision plan address reviewer concerns?
 - Programmatic & technical concerns (appropriateness, dissemination, impact, etc.)
 - Academic concerns (disciplinary grounding, relevant background)
 - Clarity
 - Methodology
- Has the applicant identified an extramural solicitation appropriate to the scope of work?
- Does the revision plan meet the funder goals and guidelines?
- Does the revision plan set forward a clear path to completion and resubmission?

1	<i>Poor.</i> Deficient in meeting all reviewer areas of concern and/or providing a plan for resubmission aligned with funder goals.
2	<i>Fair.</i> Inadequate information provided to address one or more areas of reviewer concern and/or alignment with funder goals.
3	<i>Good.</i> Adequate information provided to address at least most areas of reviewer concerns, providing a clear plan for resubmission aligned with funder goals.
4	<i>Very Good.</i> Clear information provided to address all areas of reviewer concerns, providing a clear plan for resubmission aligned with funder goals.
5	<i>Excellent.</i> Articulate and relevant information provided to clearly address all areas of reviewer concerns, providing a compelling plan for resubmission aligned with funder goals.

Broader Impacts of project under revision (5 pts)

- What is the potential for the proposed activity to benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes?
- To what extent do the proposed activities advance lasting institutional or disciplinary goals?
- To what extent does the project contribute to student-related outcomes?



1	<i>Poor.</i> Deficient in key areas for proposal evaluation or proposal does not provide a clear plan for advancing 1 or more broad impact areas.
2	<i>Fair.</i> Inadequate information provided to evaluate key areas, or proposal is unlikely to produce results advancing 1 or more broad impact areas.
3	<i>Good.</i> Adequate information provided to evaluate all areas and can produce results advancing 1 or more broad impact areas.
4	<i>Very Good.</i> Clear information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that results advance 1 or more broad impact areas.
5	<i>Excellent.</i> Articulate and relevant information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that contribution(s) significantly advance 1 or more broad impact areas.

Intellectual Merit of project under revision (5 pts)

- What is the potential for the proposed activity to advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields?
- To what extent do the proposed activities explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts?
- Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale?
- Does the plan provide clear deliverables and/or a mechanism to assess success?
- Are the proposed methods appropriate to the scope of work?

1	<i>Poor.</i> Deficient in key areas for proposal evaluation or proposal does not provide a clear plan for producing results/knowledge.
2	<i>Fair.</i> Inadequate information provided to evaluate key areas, or proposal is unlikely to produce meaningful/transformative results.
3	<i>Good.</i> Adequate information provided to evaluate all areas and can produce meaningful/transformative creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.
4	<i>Very Good.</i> Clear information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that results will likely produce meaningful/transformative creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.
5	<i>Excellent.</i> Articulate and relevant information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that contribution(s) significantly advance creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.

Feasibility of proposal when revised (5 pts)

- Does the proposal present a well-grounded case for funding the work according to revision plan?
- How well qualified is the individual, team, or organization to conduct the proposed activities?
- Does the individual or team have a track record of project completion?
- Does the proposed research include a plan to accomplish the proposed scope of work?
- Is the time committed to the project adequate?



- Are there adequate resources available to the applicant either at Cal Poly or through collaborations to carry out the proposed activities?

1	<i>Poor.</i> Deficient in key areas allowing for proposal evaluation or evaluation of PI/co-PI qualifications and record of completion of similar projects; OR revision plan is not sound.
2	<i>Fair.</i> Inadequate information provided to evaluate key areas allowing for proposal evaluation or evaluation of PI/co-PI qualifications and record of completion of similar projects; OR to evaluate the revision plan.
3	<i>Good.</i> Adequate information provided to evaluate key areas of the proposal or evaluation of PI/co-PI qualifications and record of completion; AND to evaluate the revision plan indicating that the proposal could be funded.
4	<i>Very Good.</i> Clear information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal and PI/co-PI qualifications and record of completion; AND to evaluate the revision plan indicating that the proposal has met reviewer concerns and could be funded.
5	<i>Excellent.</i> Articulate and relevant information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, and PI/co-PI qualifications and record of completion; AND to evaluate the revision plan indicating that the proposal has a high chance of being funded.