

Research Equipment Research Fund (RERF)

Research Council

Review Criteria Guidelines

OVERALL REVIEW CRITERIA SCORING - Assign **overall** scores as follows:

- 4 = Outstanding**
- Top 10-20% of proposals reviewed
 - No flaws or only those of a minor nature
 - Equipment requested will significantly advance or maintain crucial instrumentation capabilities and allow OSU to remain competitive in existing areas of funding OR will permit exploration into new and fundable areas
 - Documented evidence that equipment is needed by multiple research groups on campus
 - Very strong leverage potential, which was clearly stated
- 3 = 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
 - Limited number of users on campus, but convincing case made
 - Leverage seems possible but PI could have made a stronger case
- 2 = Good**
- Average proposal
 - Some flaws that need to be remedied
 - Problem being addressed has general significance
 - Proposal has a very limited constituency
 - Use of equipment limited to a single lab
 - Case for leverage is weak
- 1 = Weak**
- Proposal has major flaws and/or does not address an important problem
 - No leverage potential
- 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).

Scientific Merit

- Does the proposal provide a compelling argument for both the equipment and resulting research?
- Is the requested equipment crucial?
- Does the equipment provide a new/unique capability, previously unavailable at the University?
- Does the equipment replace or upgrade existing capabilities that are required for OSU investigators to be competitive for national/international funding?

Leverage

- Does the equipment support other opportunities for funding? If so, list the potential funding sources.
- Does it improve chances for funding from existing sources?
- Does it allow researchers to change directions towards work that is likely to be funded?
- Does the PI have a track record of using OSU Research Office funding to obtain additional grants and contracts?

Multiple Uses

- Will the equipment benefit more than one investigator, or more than one research group?

Need

- Does the equipment replace obsolete, but essential equipment?
- Is the request for emergency repairs on high priority equipment?

Undergraduate Research

- Does the equipment contribute to research involving undergraduates?

Industrial Collaboration

- Does the equipment promote collaboration with industry?

Reporting (score as + or -)

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

*For those investigators receiving awards, a final report will be due within 6 months of equipment procurement/repair/construction. The report should contain a brief summary of activities performed using RERF support, and it should provide a final budget statement describing how all funds were used. Recipients who fail to submit the required report will be ineligible to receive future funding from the Research Office Incentive Programs.

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.

Approved by the Research Council AY 2006-07