

#### Criteria for HSEF Element #4:

“Likelihood that the project will lead to additional extramural sources of funding.”

This review criteria is becoming increasingly important across UF internal competitions. UF Research correctly views these awards as strategic investments in future productivity, with “productivity” defined not only as publications, but also as the pursuit and receipt of externally-sponsored awards. The likelihood that HSEF funding will lead to such awards has long been part of the proposal evaluation criteria.

Beginning with the 2023 awardees (the AY2022-23 competition), HSEF recipients will not be eligible for additional HSEF funding unless and until they apply for external (non-UF) funding to support their research. The external award sought may be small and/or for a different project than the one described in their HSEF application. The application for an external award does not need to have been successful (though obviously that would be a happy outcome), but when the 2024 awardees are next eligible for HSEF funding (AY 2025-26 competition), they will be asked to provide evidence<sup>1</sup> that they have applied. With this in mind, please evaluate projects carefully with an eye to whether and how receipt of the HSEF funds would fuel applications for external awards.

How do we know whether a project would be competitive for external funding—particularly if we are not familiar with external awards ourselves? Some things to consider include:

- Many external funders prioritize the ability to **express complex ideas in language accessible to a broad educated public**. How well does this proposal do that?
- Many external funders prioritize projects that have a **clear benefit to a broad public and/or impacts beyond the academy**. If the applicant has made claims to this effect, how persuasive are they? If they have not made such claims, does the project seem to have potential in this area?
- Most proposals are reviewed by past award recipients; reviewers may not have in-depth subject area knowledge for every proposal they review. As a result, to be fundable, a project’s scope and impact need to be understandable—even if those impacts are on the scholarly field, not a broader public; the “so what?” question should be clear even to a non-expert. **Do you, as an educated non-specialist, understand the proposed scope of work and why it matters?**
- One of the best sources of external support for humanities research is small travel to collections awards. Will the later stages of this project (after the HSEF funding period ends) **require travel to specific collections/archives/field sites?**
- We are beginning to see humanities funding agencies prioritizing humanities projects that involve graduate students as co-investigators, working in partnership with a faculty member to advance their own projects and/or a larger shared project. (This is related to but not the same as serving as a research assistant.) **Are there ways that this project could open up to include graduate students in such a role?**

---

<sup>1</sup> Evidence may include an email acknowledging receipt of a proposal, an award letter, or some other communication from the funder.

- We are beginning to see humanities funding agencies offering fewer fellowships (lump sums for solo-authored work) and more grants: money to fund knowledge creation through campus and community programming, curriculum development, and graduate student support, with publications and creative works as by-products. **Are there aspects of this project that could be operationalized in this way?**

This set of questions is meant to assist you in evaluating one dimension of the project seeking HSEF funding; it is not definitive and there may be other ways in which the project seems like it would attract external support. In your comments on criteria #4, please reference any and all specific aspects of the proposal that informed your scoring, including those not mentioned here.