

Research Equipment Reserve Fund (RERF)

Faculty Senate Research Council Review Criteria Guidelines

Proposals will be reviewed ~~both~~ by at least one ~~a~~ member of the Faculty Senate Research Council and the Chair will assign a primary reviewer for each proposal ~~and by two non-Research Council reviewers.~~

It is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate Research Council primary reviewer to determine the two most qualified non-Research Council reviewers in consultation with the chair ~~from the list provided by the PI and contact those faculty members.~~

If any of the Research Council members is a lead PI, the member will be recused from the whole review. If a Research Council member is a user and/or provided a support letter for a proposal, they are not allowed to participate in review or voting of that proposal, but can review other proposals.

Reviewers will be asked to provide a summary recommendation for each proposal consisting of:

Evaluation Criteria

- High priority for funding
- Support if funds are available, or
- Not recommended for funding

In addition, reviewers will be asked to evaluate proposals based on the following criteria:

1. The technical merit of the proposal: Is the justification for the requested equipment well developed? Is the research to be supported by the proposed equipment broad based or narrowly focused? Has the PI made the case that acquisition of the proposed equipment will generate or support truly high impact research? Will this capability build on an existing area of strength within OSU, or will this expand OSU capabilities into novel areas of investigation?
2. Breadth of Use: Will the proposed equipment support multiple investigators and programs? Have OSU investigators listed as potential users provided independently prepared letters of support?
3. Ability to attract future support: Will the focus of the research to be conducted with the equipment attract diverse sponsors and provide leverage for future proposals; for example, does the research have a realistic potential to attract NIH, ~~both~~ NSF or DOE and industry/other support?
4. Has the investigator adequately documented the lack of available comparable or near-comparable capabilities on campus? In this case, "available" should be interpreted broadly to mean not only is the equipment physically present, but also has sufficient available user time to enable the PI to conduct the project? If comparable equipment is

available, does the PI build a sufficiently strong case to justify the acquisition of “duplicative” capabilities?

4. If the acquisition cost of the requested equipment is greater than \$150,000, has the investigator adequately documented that lack of available comparable or near-comparable capabilities on the campus and made a compelling case to attract new funding to OSU in the State? ~~In this case, “available” should be interpreted broadly to mean not only is the equipment physically present, but also has sufficient available user time to enable the PI to conduct the project? If comparable equipment is available, does the PI build a sufficiently strong case to justify the acquisition of “duplicative” capabilities?~~ (For example, lab personnel might be able to walk down a hall to use an ultracentrifuge, but for safety reasons, it might be unreasonable to expect them to transport samples between floors.)