GENERAL RESEARCH FUND (GRF)

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
- Addresses an important problem, will advance our knowledge of that problem
- Proposal addressed has broad constituency
- 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
- 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
- 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).

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 significant 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.
- Taking into account all review criteria, what is the proposal’s overall score?