

# Understanding the Review Process



---

# Overview of the Competitive Grant Proposal Process

- Application Process
- Review Process
- Post-Review Administration Process for Awards and Declines



# Application Process

## Request for Application (RFA)

- Posted to the CSREES website
  - [www.csrees.usda.gov](http://www.csrees.usda.gov)
  - link to “Funding opportunities” page



## Project Directors (PD)

- Prepare and submit Letter of Intent (LOI)
  - When applicable – not required for all programs
  - Requirements & guidelines provided in RFA
  - In advance of proposal deadline

# Application Process

## Project Directors (PD)

- Develop proposal in compliance with
  - Specific program goals and priorities
  - Guidelines provided in RFA
  - Submitted according to published deadlines, and electronically (if required) through [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov)




# Review Process

- Review process is designed to be fair and unbiased



- Understanding the review process for your specific program helps in preparation of a more competitive proposal

- Peer-reviewed competitive programs
  - Review by peers and other experts - provide written and/or verbal evaluations
  - Understand the review process for insight into your reviewers



- Evaluation factors are program-dependent and very important
  - Understand evaluation criteria before writing the proposal

---

# Selection of the Panel Manager


- Established scientist
- Leader in the scientific community
- Knowledgeable of current trends and priorities in the scientific area
- Hired as part-time USDA employee (1-2 years)



---

# Role of Panel Manager and National Program Leader (NPL)

- Study proposals
- Assign proposals for peer-review
  - 0 to 4 external *ad hoc* reviewers
  - 3 to 4 panelists - 1<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>o</sup>, 3<sup>o</sup>, and 'reader'



---

# Role of Panel Manager and NPL (cont.)

- Assign proposals to review panelists
  - Expertise and experience to cover portfolio of applications
  - Diverse representation
- Organize and conduct review panel

---

# Role of Panel Manager and NPL (cont.)

- Post-panel duties
  - Award administration
  - Feedback and consultation on declined proposals
  - Reporting success stories and highlights
- Program education and promotion



# Panel Member Selection

- Active in Research, Education or Extension
- Balanced to represent breadth of proposals and applicants:
  - Discipline
  - Geography
  - Institution Size and Type
  - Professional Rank
  - Gender & Ethnicity
- Continuity: experience in the review process



---

# Role of Panelists

- Review 15-20 proposals
- Provide constructive and unbiased evaluation
- Protect confidentiality
- Avoid Conflict of Interests



---

# Confidentiality

- Proposal content and identity of applicant
- Reviewer identity
- Reviews (shared with PD only)
- Panel proceedings




# Conflicts of Interest

- Advisors and advisees (lifetime)
- Collaborators and co-authors (3 years)
- Institutional
- Anyone who stands to materially profit from an award decision



# Conflicts of Interest

- Applies to NPL, Panel Manager, panelists and *ad hoc* reviewers
- May not participate in any aspect of evaluation
- May not participate in decision regarding budget, project scope, or project duration



---

# Evaluation Criteria

(e.g., NRI research proposals)

- Scientific merit
- Qualifications of project personnel, adequacy of facilities, and project management
- Relevance and importance of topic



---

# Evaluation Criteria

## Scientific merit

- Novel, innovative, unique, original
- For model systems – ability to transfer knowledge to important agricultural organisms
- Conceptual adequacy of research
- Clarity, delineation of objectives



---

# Evaluation Criteria

## Scientific merit


- Adequacy of description and suitability / feasibility of methods
- Demonstration of feasibility through preliminary data
- Probability of success



# Evaluation Criteria

Qualifications of project personnel, adequacy of facilities, and project management

- Qualifications of PD and project team, including performance record – CV
- Awareness of previous and alternative approaches – pitfalls and limitations
- Institutional experience, competence
- Adequate facilities and instrumentation
- Planning and administration of project



---

# Evaluation Criteria

## Project Relevance

- Relevant to program priorities in RFA

To yield improvements in:

- Agriculture,
- Human nutrition, food safety & quality,
- Environment, or
- Rural communities



---

# Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria – will differ for:

- Integrated Project Proposals
- Postdoctoral Fellowship Proposals
- Research Career Enhancement Proposals
- Equipment Grant Proposals
- Seed Grant Proposals
- Conference Grant Proposals



# Reviewer Evaluation of Proposals

Reviewers prepare written reviews

- Use evaluation criteria
- Address strengths and weaknesses
- Make suggestions for improvement

Reviewers provide summary rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor



# Review Panel Meeting

## During review panel meeting

- Primary reviewer summarizes proposal
- Primary, secondary, and tertiary reviewers provide evaluation and critique in order
- *Ad hoc* reviews are summarized
- Ratings available to all panelists (except those with COI)

---

# Review Panel Meeting


- Panel discussion
- Consensus and categorizing
  - Outstanding
  - High Priority
  - Medium Priority
  - Low Priority
  - Do Not Fund
- Prepare panel summary



---

# Review Panel Preparation of the Panel Summary

- **POSITIVE Aspects**
- **NEGATIVE Aspects**
- **SYNTHESIS**



# Panel Meeting: Final Day

## Re-rank of proposals:

- Re-visit categories
- Numerical ranking - usually only proposals ranked in top ~25%





# During the Review Process

- Contact NPL if you do not receive an e-mail within 4 weeks acknowledging receipt of your proposal
- Keep program updated of changes in address, phone number, status of other pending proposals, and COI status
- Wait for notification of funding decision



# Awards

- Phone Call
- Return of:
  - reviews
  - panel summary
  - relative ranking (categorical ranking)
- Complete award paperwork



# Declined Proposals

- E-mail and/or letter from National Program Leader
- Return of:
  - Written reviews
  - Panel summary
  - Relative ranking

