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General comments:
1. We need to align the review criteria with the application
2. 3 strikes you’re out
3. Should technical risk be a review criterion? If so, how do we assess?
4. How creative to be with funding – partial funding, encourage larger partnerships?
5. For projects above a certain amount, require a larger cost share?
6. Should there be a max amount to be awarded?
7. We should state the total amount of funds available for each call, and the range of funding considered for each request (e.g. 7 projects, $50-$100K each)

Bigger questions:
1. What should the total annual budget be for the RERF? This would be a separate letter.
2. Where would the funds come from?
3. Should there be separate pools for new equipment and replacement/upgrades?

Current Review Criteria (as per RERF website http://oregonstate.edu/research/incentive/rerf)

Proposals must describe the science and equipment needs to this general audience, providing clear explanations of the purpose, importance and justification of the need for this equipment, and avoiding the use of jargon and unexplained acronyms.

Need to emphasize that proposers need to express the merit in terms that are understood by a wide range of reviewers. Provide template; provide good examples.

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?
- We should ask the proposers to be specific about identifying current and future research projects

Leverage
- Does the equipment support and leverage 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?
- Does the equipment promote collaboration with industry?

**Multiple Users**

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

How do we assess and compare the benefits to an individual researcher or small group of researchers vs. a campus facility?

We need to require letters of support from each group or individual that’s listed.

What about non-Corvallis campus requests? If it is a non-Corvallis request, we suggest ask proposers to provide supporting information on how this would benefit the OSU research enterprise (e.g. student access to instrumentation, leveraging instrumentation for future OSU research, partnering with OUS that provides services to OSU).

**Need**

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

Are there other similar instruments around campus? We should place the burden on the proposer to identify/describe.

**Undergraduate Research**

- Does the equipment contribute to research involving undergraduates?

**Alignment with OSU Research Agenda** ([link to http://oregonstate.edu/research/research-agenda](http://oregonstate.edu/research/research-agenda))

**Reporting**

- If the PI has received previous funding from the Research Office, Incentive Programs (GRF, RERF or FRT) have all required reports been appropriately completed? (see "Other Requirements") ([link to http://oregonstate.edu/research/incentive/rerf#other](http://oregonstate.edu/research/incentive/rerf#other))

**Application form concerns and comments:**
The application form needs to more closely follow the guidelines published on the website (see comments below).

#6. DETAILED BUDGET. There needs to be a line item and justification paragraph for equipment maintenance.

#10. Description of industrial collaboration or undergraduate participation.
- Industrial collaboration and undergraduate participation should be separate items.
- Change “industrial collaboration” to “industrial or other external collaboration”
- Describe external collaborations (industrial, other agencies, other OUS).
• Recommend/require letters of support from collaborators/partners?
• For undergraduate participation: describe how this will advance undergraduate participation in research at OSU. Be specific.

#11. Change "Research Agenda" to "Research Thrusts" (see http://oregonstate.edu/research/research-agenda).

#15. Letters required from potential users of the equipment should be required.