CONSULTANT

Provide expert services to funded projects from outside the University of Utah

- An individual who provides professional advice or guidance and/or talk/presentation (e.g., faculty member at another institution).
- A company retained to provide services for a fee.
- Typically devote time to a project in terms of XX days/year, or XX hours/day @ \$XX/hour x XX days.
- If faculty member is affiliated with another institution, services are rendered are outside of their institutional time, commitment, and resources.
- How the grant describes consultant duties impacts the set-up process (e.g. if institutional resources, effort, etc. are mentioned, it is not a consultant agreement).
- Important to establish in the pre-award phase whether a Consulting Agreement or Subcontract will be needed.
- Individuals with University of Utah appointments cannot be listed or paid as Consultant.

SUBCONTRACTOR

The time they are devoting your grant is in lieu of time they would normally spend at their own university appointment.

- Their effort on your project (e.g., 1.2 calendar months effort) is calculated as a part of their 100% "professional time".
- They will be using a significant amount of resources (office space, supplies, computer, personnel, etc) at their own university when performing the work.
- University of Utah is required to pay the individual's institution Indirect Costs associated with their participation on the project.

FEE FOR SERVICE

Fee-for-service work typically consists of the execution of a predefined task or repetitive process, or the production of a product that meets predefined specifications. The activity, product or data collected is not expected to add to the body of fundamental knowledge of the project.

GRANT DEVELOPMENT DECISION MATRIX

Principal Project Manager: Project Focus:

	\$	Weighted Decision Criteria	ສັ	
	Negative	Neutral	Positive	
Factors	0 1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9 10	Score
1. Fit with College mission, strategic plan, research findings	Does not align with mission and plan	Marginally matches the College mission and plan	Helps fulfill the College mission and plan	
2. Background (expertise of College in this area)	Weak in area or totally new area for College	Average experience in this area	Strong experience in this area	
3. College Project Team (inhouse and new hires)	Poor in-house team with few qualified new hires available	Good in-house team, with good new hires available	Superb in-house team	
4. Return on investment (financial potential or benefit to students)	Poor short-term, poor long- term, likely to cost College or doesn't benefit students	Questionable short- or long-term benefits	Excellent short- and long- term benefits for College and students	
5. Partners (external collaborators/subcontractors)	Partners not contacted or established – weak connections	Partners will not have an effect	Partners will enhance the effort	
6. Advance information on RFP (adequate for response)	Did not expect RFP; guidelines not clear	Up-to-date with RFP, no major negatives	Good information, ready to respond	
7. Capability to respond to RFP	Do not have staff time to adequately respond	Stresses staff time, but are able to respond	Have staff time to develop highly competitive proposal	
8. Competitive assessment (competition and funding possibilities)	Competition very strong, odds are under 10%	Open competition, odds are 10 – 50%	Weak competition, odds exceed 50%	
Funding agency (contacts, history, rapport)	College is unknown to this agency and staff	College is known to agency and staff	College has well-developed working relationships	
10. College resources (space, personnel, matching funds, evaluation)	Significant investment of college resources	Marginal investment of college resources	Minimal investment of college resources	