Criteria for Reviewing the Small Grants Program (SGP) Proposals

COMMITTEE REVIEWER CRITERIA
Below are the criteria each member of the CRC Small Grant Program (SGP) 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 Small Grants Program funding:**
    - Is the proposal designed to allow for the completion of a project for which other funding is not available, and is clearly not supported by any other resources?

    NOTE: This program does not support pilot or initial funding for projects.

- **Project/Issue and Goals:**
    - Is the project/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 considering the goals/objectives of the project?

- **Significance of Intended Outcomes:**
    - Are the intended project outcomes of potential importance/significance?

- **Anticipated External Funding:**

- o Is it likely that the proposed research or creative activity will enhance the prospects for future external funding?
- o Does the plan for seeking external funding seem reasonable?

NOTE: As compared to several of the other CRC grant programs, there will be less emphasis in the SGP proposal review process on the eventual acquisition of external funding. However, this does not totally remove the need for external funding consideration.

- **Schedule of Project Activities:**
  - o Does the schedule of project activities seem realistic?
  - o Does the project schedule reflect no anticipated continuing commitment of funds, but rather the completion of a single, distinct activity?

- **Budget:**
  - o In reference to the Project Goals/Objectives and the Proposed Research Methods/Creative Activities, does the project budget seem reasonable?
  - o Does the budget fund a future completion objective, and not reimburse activity that has already occurred?

- **Department/College Support:**
  - o 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:**
  - o Are the PI and/or Co-PI(s)' other professional obligations during the award period likely to interfere with their ability to successfully complete the project?
  - o 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, identifying minor/moderate/major weaknesses specifically to correlate with the chart below.

-- Reviewers MUST include comments that indicate the reasoning for their scores. --

Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance or Strengths/Weaknesses
1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
2	Very Good	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
3	Good	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
4	Satisfactory	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
5	Average	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
6	Fair	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
7	Marginal	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
8	Poor	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
9	Unacceptable	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 CRC Small Grant Program Review Committee or be eligible for funding. The SGP Review Committee will not need to review the following items:

- **Eligibility**
    - Is the project team (PI and any Co-PIs) eligible to apply for a CRC Small Grants Program award?
    - Has the PI or any Co-PIs received a SGP in the past two years?

- **Proposal Submission**
    - Has the PI correctly completed all of the required forms? o Was the application 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)? Is the text properly formatted (11pt Arial or Times New Roman font, 1" margins)?

- Have any specialized Research Compliance Forms (animal or Human Subjects, conflict of interest, hazardous materials, etc.) been indicated and/or uploaded 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 Summary 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?