

Internal Grants Subcommittee
(approved by Senate Research Committee 12/15/03)
2005 revision

Overview of The Review Process for the
Georgia State University Internal Grants Programs
(Research Initiation, Research Program Enhancement, Mentoring, Team and Equipment Grants)

Committee Composition

A standing committee of approximately 20 members is appointed by the VP for Research with assistance from the Associate VP for Research. The members are appointed for staggered terms of up to three years. The committee chair is selected from the standing committee by the VP for Research in consultation with the Assoc VP for Research and the chair of 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 external funding support and whom have served as grant reviewers for federal agencies.

Assignment of Reviewers

The Associate VP for Research and the Internal Grant Peer Review committee chair assign three reviewers for each RPE proposal and two for all other 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 four 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 decimals (with 1 being most meritorious), and the primary and secondary reviewers submit a written review. The reviewers are provided the guidelines used by the applicants and are instructed to use the review criteria included in the guidelines to evaluate the proposal. Reviewers receive all the proposals that will be reviewed at a session and are encouraged to read all of the 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, secondary, and tertiary reviewers to verbally

announce their scores for the proposal under consideration. The three reviewers present their reviews to the full committee and discussion ensues among all committee members. For all resubmitted or renewal 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 a 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 VP for Research is responsible for organizing meetings and serves as the note taker during the review meeting. The VP for Research and the Associate VP for Research are the final arbiters for funding decisions.

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 are rated less than 1.5 or over 4.5. Copies of written reviews will be shared with the applicants as soon as possible after funding decisions are made.

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 VP for Research and not to the committee chair or members.

Other Grant Reviews

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