

GENERAL RESEARCH FUND (GRF)

RESEARCH COUNCIL REVIEW CRITERIA GUIDELINES

REVIEW CRITERIA SCORING - Assign **overall** scores:

3.10 – 4.00 = Outstanding

- Top 10-20% of proposals reviewed
- No flaws or only those of a minor nature
- Addresses an important problem, will advance our knowledge of that problem
- Proposal addressed has broad constituency
- Very strong leverage potential, which was clearly stated

2.10 – 3.00 = Excellent

- Above average but not in top 10-20% of proposals reviewed
- Minor and correctable flaws
- Addresses an important problem but one with a more limited constituency
- Leverage seems possible but PI could have made a stronger case

1.10 – 2.00 = Good

- Average proposal
- Some flaws that need to be remedied
- Problem being addressed has general significance
- Proposal has a very limited constituency
- Case for leverage is weak

0.10 – 1.00 = Weak

- Proposal has major flaws and/or does not address an important problem
- No leverage potential

0.0 = Unacceptable

- Proposal has major flaws or ethical concerns

REVIEW CRITERIA - Score the proposal with the following questions in mind. The questions reflect the review criteria described in the program guidelines. Score each of the following sections from 4 to 0 (outstanding, excellent, good, weak, unacceptable).

A PRIMARY reviewer will be assigned for each proposal. If you are the PRIMARY reviewer for a particular proposal your name will be highlighted in GRAY on the score sheet. The PRIMARY reviewer will give an overview of the proposal and lead the general discussion at the review meeting.

Scholarly Merit

- Does the proposal provide a compelling argument for the research?
- Will the proposed work significantly expand or diversify the investigators artistic or scholarly base?

- Does the proposed project represent a significant contribution to the investigator's field of study? If so, how?
- Does the proposal have the potential to significantly affect areas outside of the investigator's field?
- Is there a probability of publication or public dissemination?
- Who is the audience for the proposed work, and why will they value it?

Nature of Proposal

- Does the proposal provide a clear statement of overall project objectives?
- Are the proposed methodologies appropriate and accurate?
- Does the proposal provide clear and specific budget information? (*e.g., price quotes for specific models or quotes for repair*)
- What is the likelihood of definitive results and conclusions?
- Is the text of the proposal well written?
- Is the requested personal data well prepared?

Leverage

- Will the project lead to further scholarly activity?
- Does it improve chances for funding from existing sources?
- Does the project offer opportunities for funding from new sources?
- Does it allow researchers to change directions towards work that is likely to be funded?
- Does the project help build research networks with potential industrial clients?

Reporting (score as +/-)

- If the investigator(s) has received previous funding from the Research Office, have all required reports been appropriately completed?

Other Considerations (score as +/-)

- Is the investigator a new faculty member or faculty trying to make a significant shift in their research focus?
- Does the proposed work have real-world significance?
- Is there a need for personal encouragement?
- Does the investigator's college/department have limited research support?
- Does the project have local relevance?
- Is the project designed to help the investigator network more broadly within their field?
- Are there contributions from other sources?
- Is the timeline and budget proposed feasible?

Overall Score

- Give the proposal an overall score based on the criteria described above.
- The overall score need not be an average of the ratings for the separate sections, but the score should be reflective of the criteria ratings.