COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PILOT GRANTS PROGRAM
REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS
<u>PLEASE READ</u>

Please read through this instruction sheet BEFORE reviewing grant proposals.

This year grant reviews will be conducted electronically via a password protected website. Your password has been sent to you electronically. If you do not know your password, please contact Montelle Tamez (montelle.tamez@ucdenver.edu or 303-724-5736) or Dee Smyth (dee.smyth@ucdenver.edu or 303-724-5731).

Review website: URL: http://gcrc.ucdenver.edu/community/

After connecting to this site, you will be asked to provide your name and password. Your assigned grants will be displayed. Grant applications in pdf format are available by clicking on the link provided on the website. A link to the electronic review form will also be displayed. Please save your work frequently. For security reasons, the reviewer will be timed out after two hours on the review screen. If your review of a grant has not been saved prior to a time out, the work will not be saved. Additional guidance is provided on the website.

We will use the following process for our grant review this year:

1. **Each grant will be assigned to three reviewers –each proposal has already undergone a pre-screening to make sure it meets our criteria for length, font size, and margins.**
2. **IF YOU HAVE BEEN ASSIGNED A GRANT FOR WHICH YOU HAVE A CONFLICT OF INTEREST, PLEASE INFORM MONTELLE, via email, ASAP so assignments can be adjusted. .**
3. **You must complete the electronic grant review form for each grant – and MUST enter your scores for each section.**
4. **Please use the following scale points in assigning scores for each area -- WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO USE THE ENTIRE SCALE (WHEN APPROPRIATE), using the provided descriptors for each scale point in assigning these scores.**

Existing Scale	NIH Scale (adapted and collapsed)
5	Exceptional: Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses OR Outstanding: Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
4	Excellent: Very strong with only some minor weaknesses OR Very Good: Strong but with numerous weaknesses
3	Good: Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
2	Satisfactory: Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses OR Fair: Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
1	Marginal: A few strengths and a few major weaknesses OR Poor: Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact

Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact

Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact

5. We are required to provide each applicant with feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of their proposals. We have provided space in each section of the electronic review form for you to type in these comments. We will use your comments to compile feedback for each grant.

6. Your electronic reviews are to be completed **no later than 5:00pm on October 28th**.

7. Bonus Points: This year we are awarding up to 12 Bonus Points for applications targeted to one or more of the three health disparity focus areas (cardiovascular disease; emotional health; child health) and for applications submitted by a junior investigator. We are also awarding bonus points for proposals that are especially innovative and/or present ideas of high quality.

    a. **If a proposal focuses on one of our three health disparity priority areas, it should be awarded at least one point. Based on additional review, you can award up to 4 points**

    b. **If the proposal includes a junior investigator it should be awarded at least one point. Based on additional review of their mentoring plan, you can award up 4 points. The RFA defines a junior investigator as "investigators who are within five years of completing their training, have not previously received a federal ro1 grant, and demonstrate appropriate mentorship."**

    c. **If the proposal is especially innovative and/or the quality of its ideas is high, it can be awarded up to 4 bonus points.**

REVIEWER NAME: **CATEGORY A: JOINT PILOT GRANT REVIEW RUBRIC**

The review committee will score all applications using the following criteria and point system. Applications will be assigned to two reviewers; reviewer scores will be averaged, with applications rank ordered from highest to lowest scores.

SCORING CRITERIA: MAXIMUM OF <u>100 POINTS</u> RATE EACH ITEM ON A 5-POINT SCALE, WITH <u>1=LOWEST</u> AND <u>5=HIGHEST</u> RATING	NOTES (PLEASE INCLUDE COMMENTS ON THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES ON EACH CRITERION IN EACH CORRESPONDING NOTES BOX. TEXT BOX WILL EXPAND AS NECESSARY TO ACCOMMODATE NOTES.)

PROJECT FOCUS (15 points total – 5 points each)
    Clear description of problem/issue with strong rationale (supports with data when available) 0
    Project focuses on known health disparity in community 0
    Project clearly addresses community research translation 0 Score: 0	

DESIRED OUTCOMES (10 points – 5 points each)
    Clear articulation of planned accomplishments 0
    Clear plan for demonstrating outcomes 0 Score: 0	

STUDY DESIGN/METHODS (10 points – 5 points each)
    Clear description of research activities 0
    Methods feasible and well linked to project outcomes 0 Score: 0	

PARTNERSHIP (10 points – 5 points each)
    Clear description of partnership 0
    Experience of partnership in collaborative research partner 0 Score: 0	

PARTNERS (10 points – 5 points each)
    Background/experience of Community partner 0
    Background/experience of Academic 0 Score: 0	

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (15 points - 5 points each)
    Clear description of engagement process 0
    Clearly specifies roles of each partner in carrying out the work 0
    Appropriate roles for both community and academic partners 0 Score: 0	

FUTURE OF PARTNERSHIP (10 points – 5 points each)
    Clear description of plan after CCTSI funding 0
    Likelihood of future funding 0 Score: 0	

BUDGET (8 points – 4 points each)
    Reasonable budget for work proposed 0
    Clear justification of budget items 0 Score: 0	

REVIEWER BONUS POINTS (12 points – 4, 4, 4 points)
    Addresses PACT Designated Health Disparity Priority Focus Area(s) 0 (4 points)
    Junior Investigator with Clear Mentoring Plan 0 (4 points)
    Innovation/Quality of Idea 0 (4 points) Score: 0	

Total Points (out of 100): 0	

CHECK BOX IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS THIS APPLICATION REGARDLESS OF SCORE: ☐
CHECK BOX IF YOU THINK THIS APPLICATION HAS GREAT POTENTIAL WITH SOME TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: ☐

The review committee will score all applications using the following criteria and point system. Applications will be assigned to two reviewers; reviewer scores will be averaged, with applications rank ordered from highest to lowest scores.

SCORING CRITERIA: MAXIMUM OF <u>80 POINTS</u> RATE EACH ITEM ON A 5-POINT SCALE, WITH <u>1=LOWEST</u> AND <u>5=HIGHEST</u> RATING	NOTES (PLEASE INCLUDE COMMENTS ON THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES ON EACH CRITERION IN EACH CORRESPONDING NOTES BOX. TEXT BOX WILL EXPAND AS NECESSARY TO ACCOMMODATE NOTES.)

PROJECT FOCUS (15 points total – 5 points each)
    Clear description of problem/issue with strong rationale (supports with data when available) 0
    Project focuses on known health disparity in community 0
    Project clearly addresses community research translation 0 **Score: 0**	

DESIRED OUTCOMES (10 points – 5 points each)
    Clear articulation of planned accomplishments 0
    Clear plan for demonstrating outcomes 0 **Score: 0**	

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (15 points – 5 points each)
    Clear description of engagement process 0
    Clearly specifies roles of each partner in carrying out the work 0
    Can articulate value of partnership to this project 0 **Score: 0**	

PARTNERS (10 points – 5 points each)
    Background/experience of Community partner 0
    Background/experience of Academic partner 0 **Score: 0**	

FUTURE OF PARTNERSHIP (10 points – 5 points each)
    Clear description of plan after funding 0
    Likelihood of future funding 0 **Score: 0**	

BUDGET (8 points – 4 points each)
    Reasonable budget for work proposed 0
    Clear justification of budget items 0 **Score: 0**	

REVIEWER BONUS POINTS (12 points – 4, 4, 4 points)
    Addresses PACT Designated Health Disparity Priority Focus Area(s) 0 (4 points)
    Junior Investigator with Clear Mentoring Plan 0 (4 points)
    Innovation/Quality of Idea 0 (4 points) **Score: 0**	

Total Points (out of 80): 0	

CHECK BOX IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS THIS APPLICATION REGARDLESS OF SCORE: ☐
CHECK BOX IF YOU THINK THIS APPLICATION HAS GREAT POTENTIAL WITH SOME TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: ☐