COUNCIL ON RESEARCH & CREATIVITY

CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING PLANNING GRANT (PG) PROPOSALS

-- COMMITTEE REVIEWER CRITERIA –

Below are the criteria each member of the CRC Planning Grant (PG) 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.

- Appropriateness for Planning Grant funding:
  - Does the PI explain how the proposed work represents a new direction in research or creative activity?
    or
  - Does the PI explain how the proposed work represents continuing early support of existing research or scholarly activity?

- Project/Issue and Goals:
  - Is the issue the project will address important/significant in the PI's area of research?
  - Are the goals/objectives of the project clear?

- Research Methods/Creative Activities:
  - Are the research methods and/or creative activities appropriate in light of the goals/objectives of the project?

- 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?
  - Does the plan 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?
  - Are the supplies/materials, travel, and/or other budgeted items clearly detailed and appropriate for the work proposed?

- Department/College Support:
  - If the PI's department and/or college 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 other professional obligations during the award period likely to interfere with his/her ability to successfully complete the project?
  - Does the PI clearly explain any existing or proposed funding that would overlap with this award period?

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

* 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 Planning Grant Review Committee and will not be eligible for funding. The PG Review Committee will <u>not</u> need to review the following items:

- Eligibility
  - Is the PI eligible to apply for a CRC Planning Grant? Are Co-PI(s) eligible to apply?
  - Has the PI or any Co-PIs received a PG in the past two years?

- Proposal Submission
  - 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), if any, and their department(s) 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 (not counting references and appendices)?
  - Have any specialized Research Compliance Forms (animal or Human Subjects, conflict of interest, hazardous materials, etc.) been uploaded and/or indicated as required?
  - 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?

- 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?
- Have the CVs for the PI and Co-PI(s) been properly completed?
- 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?