

ECGPS Research Grant Scoring

Proposal Length Limit

Are all portions of the grant proposal within the specified character limits (This only applies to proposals uploaded as attachments because all applications that were typed into the specified text areas are within the character limits)?

- Yes (Then continue with grant evaluation)
- No (Then stop, grant is automatically disqualified)

Funding Priority (2 points)

1. Ph.D. dissertation research, master's thesis research (this includes only projects which, upon completion, directly qualify a student for a degree) (2)

2. Anything other than the above description (0)

Career Goals (3 points)

How would you describe the relationship between the applicant's career goals and the execution of this specific research proposal? (3 pts)

- Insignificant relationship (0)
- Weak relationship (1)
- Acceptable relationship (2)
- Very strong relationship (3)

Specific Aims and Significance (6 points):

How well are the specific aims of this research project related to broader, long-term objectives? (3 pts)

- No clear relationship (0)
- Somewhat clear relationship (1)
- Clear relationship (2)
- Very clear relationship (3)

Rate the importance of this project to (a) the applicant's discipline and (b) society. Take only the higher score and enter it in the score sheet: (3 pts)

- Not important (0)
- Somewhat Important (1)
- Important (2)
- Extremely Important (3)

Background (6 points)

How well is the background information summarized? (3 pts)

- Unclear summary (0)
- Somewhat clear summary (1)
- Clear summary (2)
- Very clear summary (3)

Given the background information cited, can the current research project be seen as a clear extension of the existing literature? (3 pts)

- No clear relationship between the problem and cited literature (0)
- Somewhat clear relationship between the problem and cited literature (1)
- Clear relationship between the problem and cited literature (2)
- Very clear relationship between the problem and cited literature (3)

Research Design and Methods (9 points)

How well does the applicant describe how he or she will conduct the research project? (3 pts).

- Unclear description (0)
- Somewhat clear description (1)
- Clear description (2)
- Very clear description (3)

How well does the applicant describe how he or she will analyze or interpret the information gathered in this project? (3 pts).

- Unclear description (0)
- Somewhat clear description (1)
- Clear description (2)
- Very clear description (3)

Does the research design proposed directly address the project's specific aims? (3 pts).

- Relationship to specific aims is unclear (0)
- Limited relationship to specific aims (1)
- Clear relationship to specific aims, but also a degree of mismatch between the two (2)
- Clear match between specific aims and the research design (3)

Timeline (3 points)

The timeline identified is appropriate for the scope of this project.

- Grossly inappropriate (0)
- Serious reservations as to whether it is feasible (1)
- Some reservations as to whether it is feasible (2)
- No reservations as to whether it is feasible (3)

Budget (3 points)

The budget specified is appropriate for the scope of this project.

- Grossly inappropriate (0)
- Serious reservations as to whether it is feasible (1)
- Some reservations as to whether it is feasible (2)
- No reservations as to whether it is feasible (3)

Overall Quality (10 points)

Considering the entire proposal (not including the abstract or career goals), how would you rate the overall quality of the proposal?

- No quality at all (0)
- Poor quality (2)
- Somewhat lacking quality (4)
- Quality (6)
- High quality (8)
- Highest quality (10)

Formatting (4 points)

- Application spelled out abbreviations/acronyms (2 pts)
- References cited appropriately (2 pts)

Letter of Recommendation (12 points)

Each letter is worth a maximum of 6 points each.

How equipped is the applicant to conduct the research? (3 points per letter)

- Not at all (0)
- Somewhat equipped (1)
- Equipped (2)
- Extremely equipped (3)

How much will this research benefit people other than the applicant (e.g., the applicant's department, professional discipline, or society)? (3 points per letter)

- Not at all (0)
- Some benefit to others (1)
- Distinct benefit to others (2)
- Tremendous benefit to others (3)

Abstract (6 points)

Note: Please score after reading the entire proposal.

The abstract clearly summarizes the problem/motivation guiding the research. (3 pts)

- Unclear summary (0)
- Somewhat clear summary (1)
- Clear summary (2)
- Very clear summary (3)

The abstract clearly summarizes the proposed research methods.

- Unclear summary (0)
- Somewhat clear summary (1)
- Clear summary (2)
- Very clear summary (3)

Your Recommendation:

Taking everything into consideration, what is your recommendation for funding?:

Please enter “fund” if you believe the application should be funded

Please enter “if available” if you believe the application should be funded only if funds are available

Please enter “reject” if you believe the application should not be funded

Provide a brief (i.e., 2 sentences) justification of your funding decision. For example, I believe that Bob Johnson should (receive funding, not receive funding, receive funding only if funds are available) because ...

Feedback for Applicant:

Note: Specific scores and your recommendation in the previous section will not be provided to applicants. The purpose of this section is for applicants to be able to obtain some feedback regarding their application. Please make an effort to provide concrete and constructive advice to the applicants.

For this section, write:

- ▶ 2-3 sentences on the strengths of the application.
- ▶ 2-3 sentences on areas for improvement.

You may include additional comments if you would like to.