

The Social Impact Community (SIC) supports research that contributes to building a more equitable, sustainable, and resilient society. Our vision is that the Tippie College of Business is recognized as a leader in social impact research, a destination for students interested in addressing societal challenges, and a resource for organizations attempting to maximize outcomes across stakeholder groups.

This fall, the SIC has \$7,500 in funding from donors and sponsored research revenue to support small research grants. This initiative is aligned with our strategic goal to support and grow social impact research at Tippie through funding and connections. Social impact research includes any research that has the potential to have a positive impact on stakeholders, including employees, communities, society, or the planet. This includes research relating to environmental sustainability, DEI, social justice, employee well-being, decent work, corporate social responsibility, ESG, resilience, ethics, risk management, security, and other ways business positively impacts the world. If you are uncertain whether a project fits under the social impact umbrella, please contact Amy Colbert (amy-colbert@uiowa.edu) to ask.

Similar to the Tippie College of Business Research Excellence Grants, the SIC grants can be used to jumpstart new projects, run new studies for paper revisions, or pilot projects for potential external funding, to cite a few examples.

Proposal Guidelines

Applicants

Principal investigators must be affiliated with a Tippie department as full-time, tenure-track faculty member throughout the duration of the grant period. Other co-investigators need not be Tippie faculty.

Criteria (See proposal scoring guidelines for more details)

- Significance
- Innovation
- Approach
- Investigator and team qualifications
- Research plans
- Overall impact

Types of support

- Remuneration for required support personnel (e.g., hourly student wages)
- Research support (e.g., hardware, software, communications, supplies)
- Subject compensation
- Travel costs for visiting co-authors
- Other support deemed appropriate by the SIC Faculty Committee

Product

In return for funding, Tippie expects that substantive progress be made on the research project within 1 year of receipt of the funds. Documentation of progress could include a working paper, conference presentation, manuscript submitted to a journal, technical report, or progress report. If a product is not created, the PI will not be considered for future funding requests within 3 years.

Schedule

• Pre-submission requests due: October 25

• Selected applicants notified to submit a full proposal: November 8

Full applications due: December 2Notice of award: December 13

Application Procedure

- 1) Pre-submission requests. Submit copy electronically to mae-mcdonough@uiowa.edu
 - a. Contents
 - i. Cover form (see p. 3)
 - ii. Abstract (200-500 word statement of proposed research)
 - b. Review
 - i. Will be reviewed by SIC faculty committee
 - ii. An overall Yes or No vote on the pre-submission proposal will be provided.
 - iii. Notification to proceed and/or feedback for future submissions may be available
- 2) Full proposal (after receiving pre-submission approval). Submit copy electronically to mcdonough@uiowa.edu
 - a. Contents
 - i. Cover form (see p. 3)
 - ii. Abstract (200-500 word statement of proposed research)
 - iii. Proposal (3-page limit) describing the research and justifying the request for funds. The proposal should include:
 - (1) Specific aims
 - (2) Background and significance
 - (3) Design and methods
 - (4) Limitations
 - (5) Research timeline
 - (6) Future research and dissemination plans
 - iv) Budget, including funding priorities, if appropriate
 - v) CV or Biographical sketch formatted according to NIH or NSF guidelines
 - b) Referee procedure
 - i) There will be a minimum of 3 readers comprised of SIC faculty committee members or outside

referees selected because of their expertise

- ii) Committee meeting to discuss proposals
- iii) Decision
 - (1) Vote, with explanation
 - (2) Budget modifications, if any
 - (3) Decision and justification sent to proposer

Application

Principal Investigator(s):
Project Title:
Department(s):
Grant Period:
Amount Requested:
Intended Use of Funds:
Abstract (200-500 word statement of proposed research)5

General Policy Guidelines for Research Support

When asking for funding for your research projects, please keep the following rules in mind:

- 1. Grants requests may be up to \$7,500. We encourage smaller requests as well, so that the SIC can fund more projects (e.g., one \$5,000 project and one \$2,500, or three \$2,500 projects). Depending on the number and quality of the proposals, we may propose budget modifications so that we can fund more than one project.
- 2. Funding requests for faculty salary or conference travel will not be approved.
- 3. All grants are for one year and may not be renewed, but extensions may be granted with appropriate justification. Requests for extensions must be submitted one year from notice of award. Funds not expended by the completion date will be returned to the respective funding pool.
- 4. Award funds must be used for the research project as described in the application. If a modification to the project is required, a request for transferred use of the funds may be submitted to the Research Committee for consideration.
- 5. If funding is being requested for subject compensation, Tippie will generally allow a maximum of \$10 per subject hour. Justification for not utilizing subject pools within the college and/or rationale for higher compensation must be provided. If payment is contingent on performance, higher amounts may be permissible.

Pre-Submission

Proposal Score Sheet

(Internal Use)

	•	•	
Principal Investigator (s):			
Title of Proposal:			

	Significance	Innovation	Approach	PI and Team Qualifications	Future Research Plans	Overall Impact
Score						
(1-9)						

Full Proposal Score Sheet

(Internal Use)

Principal	Investigator (s)):				
Title of P	roposal:					
	Significance	Innovation	Approach	PI and Team	Future	Overall
				Qualifications	Research	Impact
					Plans	
Score						
(1-9)						
		-				
Significa	ance					
Innovat	ion					
Approa	ch					
PI and 7	Геат Qualificat	ions				
Future Research Plans						
Overall Impact						

Proposal Scoring Guidelines

The following descriptions provide guidance for scoring. Reviewers will score each area using a scale of 1-9.

High Scores: 1 (exceptional), 2 (outstanding), and 3 (excellent); Moderate Scores: 4 (very good), 5 (good), 6 (satisfactory), and

Low Scores: 7 (fair), 8 (marginal), and 9 (poor)

<u>Significance</u>: Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or practice be improved? Does the project build on previous research by the investigator? How will successful completion of the aims change the field?

<u>Innovation</u>: Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research paradigms? Does the research solve new or existing problems?

<u>Approach</u>: Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analysis well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies and benchmarks for success presented? Is the project feasible?

<u>Investigator and Interdisciplinary Team</u>: Are the PI, collaborators, and other research team members well-suited for the project? Do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise? Is their organizational structure appropriate for the project?

<u>Future Research Plans</u>: Are there plans for the next step in this program of research? Does the project have a high likelihood of being self-sustaining in the future (committee will look favorably on matching funds or seed money requests)? Have future funding sources been identified? Is there a clear need for additional funding?

<u>Overall Impact</u>: The likelihood of a project to have a sustained, powerful influence on the research area based on the review criteria. Reviewers should consider scientific impact as well as impact on organizational practices although a proposal does not need to be strong in both areas.