Criteria for Reviewing Equipment and Infrastructure Enhancement Grant (EIEG) Proposals

COMMITTEE REVIEWER CRITERIA

Below are the criteria each member of the Equipment and Infrastructure Enhancement Grant (EIEG) 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:**
  - Is the project or issue that the proposed equipment/infrastructure enhancement will address important or significant in the PI and Co-PI(s)' area(s) of research?
  - Are the goals/objectives of this equipment or infrastructure enhancement clear?
  - Does the equipment already exist on campus?

- **Research Methods/Creative Activities:**
  - Does the proposal provide adequate evidence that the addition of the proposed equipment or infrastructure enhancement will increase the research capabilities of the multidisciplinary users identified in the proposal?

- **Broader Impacts:**
  - Do the intended outcomes of this equipment or infrastructure enhancement have a direct contribution to a new tangible public benefit, beyond its immediate research goals?

- **Funding Information**:
  - Does the explanation of why this equipment or tool has not been previously funded seem reasonable?
  - If applicable, is it likely that the users' plans and probability assessment for receiving external matching are accurate and achievable?

- **Budget:**
  - Referencing this proposal's goals and objectives and the type of equipment/infrastructure enhancement proposed, does the detailed quotation from the vendor seem reasonable?
  - Are the PI's and Co-PI(s)' departments contributing cost share, if available, to support this purchase?

- **Management of the Equipment:**
  - Does the proposal describe who will be responsible for the extraneous expenses, such as installation, operation, repairs, maintenance, and replacement of the equipment or tool?
  - Are the plans for the maintenance of this equipment or infrastructure enhancement equitable and accessible?
  - Is cost-sharing involved in these expenses, if necessary?

- **Impact of Previous EIEG Awards:**
  - Have the PI and Co-PI(s) used previous EIEG awards as proposed?
  - Is the equipment still actively used and properly maintained?

SCORING SCALE

Reviewers should provide a numeric score and comments for each proposal, identifying minor/moderate/major weaknesses specifically to correlate with the chart below.

SCORE	DESCRIPTOR	POTENTIAL	IMPACT	ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE FOR STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES*
1	Exceptional	Fundable	High	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
2	Very Good	Fundable		Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
3	Good	Fundable		Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
TYPICAL FUNDING LINE				
4	Satisfactory	Potentially Fundable	Medium	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
5	Average	Potentially Fundable		Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
6	Fair	Potentially Fundable		Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
7	Marginal	Not Fundable	Low	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
8	Poor	Not Fundable		A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
9	Unacceptable	Not Fundable		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 be disqualified from competition and will not be reviewed by the EIEG Review Committee or be eligible for funding. The EIEG Review Committee will not need to review the following items:

- **Eligibility**
  - Is the project team (PI and Co-PIs) eligible to apply for a CRC Equipment + Infrastructure Enhancement Grant?

- **Proposal Submission**

- Has the PI correctly completed all of the required forms?
- Was the application 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 (not counting references and appendices)? Is the text properly formatted (11pt Arial or Times New Roman font, 1" margins)?
- 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 Summary been properly completed? Is the proposed use of the award funds acceptable in light of the funding rules for this grant program? Have cost sharing or support documents been uploaded?
- 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?