## -- COMMITTEE REVIEWER CRITERIA --

Below are the criteria each member of the CRC Multidisciplinary Support Grant (MDS) Review Committee will use to assist them in (a) critiquing a proposal, (b) providing useful feedback to the PI, and (c) determining an overall score for the proposal.

\*\*Keep in mind that each section of the proposal text should be written in clear, concise language so that reviewers from any discipline will be able to understand what is being stated.\*\*

# • Project/Issue and Goals:

Does the project fit the purpose of the MDS program? Is the project/issue the project will address important/significant in the PI's and Co-PI(s)' area of research? Are the goals/objectives of the project clear? Does the proposal state:

- o The scholarly and, where appropriate, the artistic merits of the proposed activity?
- The effect the project will have on advancing knowledge and understanding in the field represented by the proposed work?
- The relationship of the work to existing or planned institutional research and creative programs and capacities as a statement of how the proposed program would enhance the PI/ Co-PI(s)' research and creative activity at FSU?

## Research Methods/Creative Activities:

Are the research methods and/or creative activities appropriate in reference to the goals/objectives of the project? Are the multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary partners clearly identified and well-suited to the project? Does the proposal indicate the overall integration, coherence, and credibility of the efforts among disciplines and researchers who would carry out the proposed plan?

# Significance of Intended Outcomes:

Are the intended project outcomes of potential importance/significance?

## Anticipated External Funding:

Is it likely that the proposed research or creative activity will enhance the prospects for external funding? Do the plans for seeking external funding seem reasonable?

## Schedule of Project Activities:

Does the schedule of project activities seem realistic? Does the proposal indicate the anticipated progress during the grant period?

## Budget:

In reference to the Project Goals/Objectives and the Proposed Research Methods/Creative Activities, does the project budget seem reasonable? Is the budget appropriate for the project in regards to its duration, staffing, and purchasing needs? Does the project budget stay within program guidelines for allowable expense categories?

# • Department/College Support:

If the PI's and Co-PI(s)' departments and/or colleges will be providing any special or non-routine support for the project, is it likely that such support will contribute to the success of the project?

## Professional Obligations:

Are the PI's and Co-PI(s)' other professional obligations during the award period likely to interfere with their ability to successfully complete the project?

# Scoring Scale

# Reviewers should provide a numeric score and comments for each proposal.

| IMPACT | Score | DESCRIPTOR   | ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE OR STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES*        |
|--------|-------|--------------|---|
| High   | 1     | Exceptional  | Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses |
|        | 2     | Outstanding  | Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses         |
|        | 3     | Excellent    | Very strong with only some minor weaknesses         |
| Medium | 4     | Very Good    | Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses           |
|        | 5     | Good         | Strong but with at least one moderate weakness      |
|        | 6     | Satisfactory | Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses    |
| Low    | 7     | Fair         | Some strengths but with at least one major weakness |
|        | 8     | Marginal     | A few strengths and a few major weaknesses          |
|        | 9     | Poor         | Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses    |

<sup>\*</sup> Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact

#### -- PROGRAM STAFF CRITERIA -

Below are the criteria the CRC Program Staff will use to review each proposal. If any of these criteria are not met, the proposal will not be reviewed by the CRC MDS Grant Review Committee and will not be eligible for funding. The MDS Review Committee will <u>not</u> need to review the following items:

#### Eligibility

- o Are the PI and Co-PI(s) eligible to apply for a CRC Multidisciplinary Support Grant?
- o Has the PI or Co-PI(s) received a MDS in the past two years?
- o Does the PI have a well-funded research program?
- o Are the Investigators from at least two difference academic departments or units?

## Proposal Submission

- o Has the PI correctly completed all of the required forms?
- Was the Proposal Transmittal form properly completed within the portal? Have the Co-PI(s) and their departments been indicated in the portal?
- Does the Proposal text include all of the required sections? Is each section properly titled and numbered? Is the length of the proposal text no more than 8 pages, excluding references and appendices?
- o Have any specialized Research Compliance Forms (Animal or Human Subjects, conflict of interest, hazardous materials, etc.) been indicated and/or uploaded as required?
- o Has the Past, Current, and Pending Grants section of the portal been properly completed? Have all CRC awards/grants in the last 5 years been disclosed by the PI and Co-PI(s)? Have outcomes been given for each?

- o Has the Proposal Budget been properly completed? Is the proposed use of the award funds acceptable in light of the funding rules for this grant program?
- o Have the Curricula Vitae for the PI and Co-PI(s) been properly completed?
- o Did the PI submit the proposal in time to meet the submission deadline? Did the Chair(s) and Dean(s) approve the proposal by their approval deadline?