**Robbins College**

**Research Award Program**

**Robbins Faculty Development Committee:**

One of your roles as a member of this committee is to provide a critical peer review of the Robbins Research Award Program applications. This is a vital role and your charge in this review is to: (1) confirm the faculty member’s plans to submit a substantial and related external proposal to support this research line, (2) evaluate whether you believe the proposed project will result in the faculty member submitting a substantially stronger external proposal, than without the proposed project, and (3) review the overall potential impact of the proposed work using the review criteria below. Please see a more detailed description regarding the assignment and definition of score values on the final page of this document.

1. **Does the faculty member articulate plans to submit a substantial and related external proposal related to the proposed seed project?**
2. **Based on your review, do you believe the proposed project will result in the faculty member submitting a substantially stronger external proposal, than without the proposed project?**
3. **Review Criteria**

Please assign an Overall Impact Score to this proposal considering your evaluation of the 2 Factors below.

Score from 1-9, where 1 = exceptional and 9 = poor AFTER scoring Factors 1 & 2 below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall Impact Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |

**Factor 1: Please Score the Proposal on the Importance of the Research**

(Score from 1-9, where 1 = exceptional and 9 = poor.)

**Significance**

Evaluate the importance of the proposed research in the context of current scientific challenges and opportunities, either for advancing knowledge within the field, or more broadly. Assess whether the application addresses an important gap in knowledge in the field, would solve a critical problem, or create a valuable conceptual or technical advance.

Evaluate the rationale for undertaking the study, the rigor of the scientific background for the work (e.g., prior literature and/or preliminary data) and whether the scientific background justifies the proposed study.

**Innovation**

Assess the influence of scientific innovation on the importance of the proposed research. Note that while technical or conceptual innovation can influence the importance of undertaking the work, a project that is not applying novel concepts or approaches may be of critical importance for the field.

Assess whether the proposed work applies novel concepts, methods or technologies in ways that will enhance the overall impact of the project.

|  |
| --- |
| **Factor 1 – Importance of the Research**(Score from 1-9, where 1 = exceptional and 9 = poor.) |
| *Please provide a written critique regarding this proposal in the following areas:* | **Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
| **Major Score – Driving Factors** |  |
| **Strengths** |  |
| **Weaknesses** |  |
| **Minor Points (optional)** |  |

**Factor 2: Please Score the Proposal on the Rigor and Feasibility**

(Score from 1-9 where 1 = exceptional and 9 = poor.)

**Approach**

Evaluate the scientific quality of the proposed work. Evaluate the likelihood that compelling, reproducible findings will result (rigor) and assess whether the proposed studies can be done well and within the timeframes proposed (feasibility).

**Rigor**

Evaluate the potential, **IF** the proposal were to be executed in its entirety for a full grant submission, for the proposed work to produce:

* unbiased, reproducible, robust data;
* experimental design with appropriate controls;
* a sufficient and well-justified sample size;
* quality of the plans for analysis, interpretation, and reporting of results;
* adequate plans to address relevant biological variables, such as sex or age, in the design, analysis, and reporting; and
* *(for applications involving human subjects or vertebrate animals)*, also evaluate the potential of:
	+ the rigor of the intervention or study manipulation (if applicable to the study design)
	+ justified outcome variables
	+ whether the results will be generalizable or, in the case of a rare disease/special group, relevant to the particular subgroup
	+ whether the sample will contain sufficient representative diversity to address the proposed question(s).

**Feasibility**

Evaluate whether the proposed approach is sound and achievable, including plans to address problems or new challenges that emerge in the work. For proposed studies in which feasibility may be less certain, evaluate whether the uncertainty is balanced by the potential for major advances.

|  |
| --- |
| **Factor 2 – Rigor and Feasibility**(Score from 1-9, where 1 = exceptional and 9 = poor.) |
| *Please provide a written critique regarding this proposal in the following areas:* | **Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
| **Major Score – Driving Factors** |  |
| **Strengths** |  |
| **Weaknesses** |  |
| **Minor Points (optional)** |  |

## Scoring Table for Research Grant Applications

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Degree of Impact** | **Impact Score** | **Descriptor** | **Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses** |
| High | 1 | Exceptional | Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses |
| 2 | Outstanding | Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses |
| 3 | Excellent | Very strong with only some minor weaknesses |
| Moderate | 4 | Very Good | Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses |
| 5 | Good | Strong but with at least one moderate weakness |
| 6 | Satisfactory | Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses |
| Low | 7 | Fair | Some strengths but with at least one major weakness |
| 8 | Marginal | A few strengths and a few major weaknesses |
| 9 | Poor | Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses |
| **DefinitionsMinor**: easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen the impact of the project.**Moderate**: weakness that lessens the impact of the project.**Major**: weakness that severely limits the impact of the project. |

 (<https://www.niaid.nih.gov/grants-contracts/scoring-summary-statements>)