Committee Composition

The Internal Grants Peer Review committee is a standing committee of from 20-30 scholars engaged, by invitation to participate, by the Associate Director for Special Initiatives with assistance from the Associate Deans for Research and Department Chairs. The members are appointed for staggered terms of up to three years. The committee chair is selected from the standing committee by the Associate Director for Special Initiatives in consultation with the Senate Research Committee Internal Grants Subcommittee.

Eligibility Criteria

The committee members are generally faculty who are accomplished scholars drawn from across the university community, many of whom have received both internal and external funding support and whom have served as grant reviewers for federal agencies. Other members of the committee are well-published and highly regarded scholars in their areas of expertise.

Assignment of Reviewers

The Associate Director for Special Research Initiatives, with assistance as needed from the Internal Grant Peer Review committee chair, assigns two reviewers for all proposals. The goal is that these reviewers do not reside in the department of the PI or Co-PI(s), but are drawn from an appropriately similar area or discipline. On average, each reviewer is responsible for reviewing six proposals.

The Review Process

Reviewers are advised of the confidentiality of the review process. They are not to discuss applications or panel discussions that occur during the review process with others outside the review committee. The reviewers are responsible for carefully reading the proposal, scoring it on a 5-point scale (with 1 being most meritorious), and submit written reviews. The reviewers are provided the submission guidelines and are instructed to use the review criteria included in those guidelines to evaluate the proposal. Reviewers receive all the proposals that will be reviewed at a session and are encouraged to read other proposals in their realm of expertise and to provide feedback during the discussion of those proposals. Reviewers will receive this description of the process as well as the RFPs for all grant programs.

Committee Procedure

The committee chair presides over the meeting. For individual applications, members will recuse themselves when there is a perceived or real conflict of interest. For each application, the chair requests the primary and secondary reviewers to verbally
announce their scores for the proposal under consideration. These reviewers present their reviews to the full committee and discussion ensues among all committee members. For all resubmitted applications, materials related to previous reviews in prior years may be consulted. Upon the conclusion of the discussion, reviewers are asked if they wish to modify their scores. Scores may be modified or not, and other committee members are asked if those scores reflect their views. If any committee member objects to the scores further discussion occurs until a consensus is reached. The chair may request that each member submit a score within the range of the reviewers’ scores if the committee cannot reach a consensus. The committee may also make budgetary recommendations. The Associate Director for Special Initiatives is responsible for organizing meetings and serves as the note taker during the review meeting.

Proposal Scores and Reviews

Proposals with the lowest scores have the highest probability of being funded. Thus, a proposal whose average score is 1.8 will have a higher probability of funding than one scored 2.3. Scores less than 2.0 are likely to be funded (contingent on the overall distribution of scores), and scores 3.0 and higher are unlikely to be funded. Few proposals should typically be rated less than 1.5 or over 4.5. A summary of the written reviews will be shared with the applicants as soon as possible after funding decisions are made and when award notifications are sent out.

Applicants and the Review Committee

Applicants are not to discuss their applications with reviewers. Concerns and questions about committee decisions or review procedures should be addressed to the Associate Director for Special Research Initiatives and not to the committee chair or members.

Funding Decisions

The final scores are ranked and those proposals scored between 1 and 2.5 are submitted to the Senate Research Committee Internal Grants Subcommittee for review. This committee will submit their recommendations for funding from this list to the VP for Research and the Associate Director for Special Initiatives who are the final arbiters for funding decisions.

Other Grant Reviews

Dissertation grants, conference grants, and any other GSURF funded grants are reviewed on an ad hoc basis as determined by the VP for Research and Associate Director for Special Research Initiatives.