

**UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH**

RESEARCH SUPPORT GRANT REVIEW PROCEDURE

The review committee will have representation from different areas of expertise. Review assignments will be made to avoid conflicts of interest and provide expertise to assure appropriate review. All materials distributed to the reviewers are confidential. A copy of the reviews with identifiers deleted and the decision of the committee will be provided to the Principal Investigator (PI). Each proposal will be assigned a primary and secondary reviewer who will prepare written reviews. The primary reviewer will present the proposal to the review committee for discussion and ranking.

Review Criteria:

Reviewers will prepare a short (1-2 pages) review that will identify the proposal's strengths and weaknesses relative to the following criteria:

- **Goals/Objectives.** Is the overall goal of the project well conceived?
- **Intrinsic Merit.** Is the project significance, original and creative? If the project is successful, will it result in an important, original contribution?
- **Design & Procedures.** Is the design appropriate to achieve the stated goals? Is the approach sound and innovative?
- **Feasibility.** Is the project likely to succeed? Does the applicant have sufficient time to complete the project? Are the necessary support resources available?
- **Qualifications.** Does the applicant have the training and demonstrated expertise in the area of the proposed project?
- **Productivity.** Has the applicant demonstrated productivity in publications and creative works?
- **Outcomes.** Will the data generated be sufficient to support a competitive external research grant or, where appropriate, scholarly publication?
- **Impact.** What will be the impact of this internal funding on the future of the applicant's research program?
- **Budget Evaluation.** Is the budget appropriate?

Recommendations: Prepare a brief summary identifying the main strengths and weaknesses of the proposal.

Scoring: Do not score with more than one decimal point.

- 1.0-1.5 – Excellent application, recommend funding as submitted.
- 1.6-2.0 – Very good application, recommend funding with possible adjustments.
- 2.1-3.0 – Good application, recommend possible funding.
- 3.0-3.9 – Application needs work.
- 4.0-5.0 – Application is not fundable, recommend mentoring for PI.