

<b>Investigator:</b>  <b>Title of proposal:</b>	5 = excellent 4 = very good / well done 3 = satisfactory/meets expectations 2 = needs slight improvement 1 = needs significant improvement 0 = unacceptable NA = not applicable  <b>Enter score: 0 - 5</b>
<b>Scientific Merit</b> <i>(consider the questions below and insert ONE mark in the appropriate column)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the proposal clearly convey the tasks and activities that will be carried out and the products or outcomes that will be produced?</li> <li>Is the methodology sound? Will the conclusions be valid?</li> <li>Is the assessment plan appropriate and robust? Will it result in valid, reportable results?</li> <li>Is the proposed data analysis appropriate and sufficient?</li> <li>Is the appropriate support (e.g. statistical consultation) in place or readily available?</li> <li>Is the research timeline outlined in the proposal realistic and attainable?</li> </ul>	
<b>Significance / Potential Impact</b> <i>(insert ONE mark in the appropriate column)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the proposal address a significant issue or problem in STEM, DVM, or graduate student education?</li> <li>Is the overall argument for the project strong? Is it based in current educational theory and appropriate, up-to-date educational literature?</li> <li>Is it clear what will be learned that will be of interest to other educators?</li> <li>Are the reported results likely to influence or change the way that students in our programs or similar programs are educated?</li> </ul>	
<b>Overall Quality of the Proposal</b> <i>(insert ONE mark in the appropriate column)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the proposal meet all requirements specified in the Call for Proposals?</li> <li>Is the proposal clearly written and organized - without spelling, grammar or syntax problems?</li> <li>Is the proposal cogent, logical, and compelling?</li> <li>Is the proposal realistic and appropriate with respect to tasks, timelines, and deliverables?</li> <li>Is the budget appropriately distributed for the specified project activities, with proper justification? Are the dollar amounts appropriate for each stated need?</li> <li>Are there clear deliverables and timelines for the production of peer-reviewed journal article or articles and/or a proposal for external funding?</li> </ul>	
Priority Area #1: Likelihood of an extramural proposal	
Priority Area #2: Publication plan and potential impact	
Priority Area #3: Plan for Scholarly Presentation <i>(extramural? Peer-reviewed?)</i>	
	Yes or No ? (5 pts)
Priority Area #4: Collaboration	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WSU College of Education (COE)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other CVM departments</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partner institutions</li> </ul>	
Priority Area #5: New faculty	
Priority Area #6: Transition to or Exploration of a new research focus	
Priority Area #7: Previous record of success <i>(funding and publication)</i>	

**Score calculation:** Enter number score from score sheet on line in first column

1. (Merit) \_\_\_\_\_ x 8 = \_\_\_\_\_
2. (Impact) \_\_\_\_\_ x 8 = \_\_\_\_\_
3. (Overall) \_\_\_\_\_ X 4 = \_\_\_\_\_

**Subtotal** \_\_\_\_\_ **(from 100 possible)**

**Priority Score:** Enter number score from score sheet on line in first column

1. Extramural Proposal    \_\_\_    X 3    \_\_\_\_\_
2. Publication Plan        \_\_\_    X 3    \_\_\_\_\_
3. Presentation Plan       \_\_\_    X 3    \_\_\_\_\_
4. Collaboration \*
  - COE                        \_\_\_    X 2    \_\_\_\_\_
  - CVM depts.                \_\_\_    X 1    \_\_\_\_\_
  - Other partners            \_\_\_    X 1    \_\_\_\_\_

*(departments, universities, etc.)*
5. New Faculty \*            \_\_\_    X 4    \_\_\_\_\_
6. Transition \*              \_\_\_    X 2    \_\_\_\_\_
7. Previous Record         \_\_\_    X 1    \_\_\_\_\_

\* Yes = 5 pts.

**Priority Subtotal** \_\_\_\_\_ **(from 100 possible)**

**TOTAL SCORE:**

**INVESTIGATOR:**

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:**

**REVIEWER:**

## **Suggestions for Review of CVM/COE Faculty Research Funding Award Proposals**

Good reviews of faculty work are challenging to do. Reviews require a good deal of time (something in short supply). Reviews also require thoughtfulness not only about the substance being reviewed but also in the way the feedback is given. In reviewing proposals for faculty research funding awards, please remember that you are providing the dean's office with information that will help make decisions for awards and critical feedback to your colleagues to help them strengthen future proposals. In some cases, the feedback to faculty is also a means to mentor faculty in the proposal writing process. If you can find a way to strike a tone of simultaneously being constructively critical and supportive, that is ideal (modified from the WSU College of Education, Dr. Mike Trevisan – Dean)

**Note that the reviews will be shared with each faculty member. These reviews will be anonymous.**

Please use the attached review form to provide comments. Even a few sentences in each section would be most helpful. In the summary section, rather than reiterating statements you've already made, provide an overall summary of the project using 50-100 words.

### **OVERALL RECOMMENDATION:**

**At the end of the document, you will be asked to rate the proposal with one of the following criteria:**

- Recommend funding**
- Possibly Acceptable – pending further discussion by review committee**
- Possibly Acceptable – specific revisions requested/needed**
- Funding Not Recommended**

**Educational Research Grants (ERG)  
PROPOSAL RATING SHEET  
2019**

---

**Proposal Title:**

**Reviewer:**

**Reviewer's Brief Description of Project:** *3-5 sentences to CVM Dean and Development Office*

**Reviewer's Comments:**

1. *Rationale & Background / Potential Impact*
2. *Scientific Merit (Research Plan)*
3. *Other (as needed)*
  - *Timeline*
  - *Plans for peer-reviewed manuscript(s), scholarly presentation, and/or external funding proposal(s)*
  - *Budget*
  - *Personnel, including collaborators*
  - *Progress Report (if applicable)*

**Overall Recommendation:**

**Rating:**