

# NHS GRIP Review Criteria

## Categories for Review

1. Complete application. If no, then the review ends and the proposal is not funded
  - a. Additional completeness criteria for Resubmissions
    - i. The reviewer's comments are included
    - ii. A plan to address the reviewers' comments is included
2. Intellectual Merit (IM) and Broader Impacts (BI) (weighted most heavily)
3. Alignment with the mission and priorities (AMP) of NHS/UNC
4. Potential for success of the extramural funding request
5. Budget
  - a. Amount of extramural funds sought
  - b. Cost-sharing requirements
  - c. Ability to generate indirect funds

## Five NSF Review Elements

The following elements should be considered in the review for both criteria:

1. What is the potential for the proposed activity to:
  - a. advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields (Intellectual Merit-IM); and
  - b. benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes (Broader Impacts-BI)?
2. To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts?
3. Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success?
4. How well qualified is the individual, team, or institution to conduct the proposed activities?
5. Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home institution or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities?

## Reviewer Ratings: E, V, G, F, P

When you give a rating, make sure that your written text is in harmony with the rating, that is, don't rate something Excellent and then point out a lot of negatives, or conversely, praise a proposal a lot then just rate it as only Good. Write a sentence or two for each review category

1. Excellent
2. Very good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor

## Outcome of the review

1. A written summary of the review based on the advisory board discussion which includes a brief analysis of how well the proposal addresses both review criteria: intellectual merit and broader impacts
2. Provide individual ratings and overall ratings
3. Proposal strengths and weaknesses
4. Reasons for a declination, if appropriate

## GRIP Review Template

1. Name of reviewer
2. Name of proposer
3. Name of project
4. Internal funding type: GRIP/GRIP<sup>2</sup>
5. Requesting funding for Spring/Summer/Fall
6. Completeness criteria
  - a. timeline for writing the proposal
  - b. the agency(ies) to which the proposal will be submitted
  - c. deadline for receipt of the proposal
  - d. projected amount of extramural funds to be sought
  - e. cost-sharing requirements, if applicable
  - f. the relevant indirect cost recovery rate(s)
    - i. amount of indirects expected if funded. If amount not given, compute amount.  
Not a reason to rule the application is incomplete
  - g. any prior efforts to attract extramural support for the project, including
    - i. funding source
    - ii. amount of support requested
    - iii. outcome
  - h. Additional criteria for Resubmission GRIP
    - i. The reviewer's comments are included
    - ii. A plan to address the reviewers' comments is included

## Review

1. Completeness: This will be determined by the chair and one other member of the committee. If no, then the review ends and the proposal is not funded.
2. Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts (weighted most heavily) of the grant funding concept (E, V, G, F, P). Please address strengths and weaknesses.
3. Alignment with the mission and priorities of NHS/UNC (E, V, G, F, P)
4. Potential for success of the extramural funding request (really done with IM & BI)
5. Budget
  - a. Amount of extramural funds sought
  - b. Cost-sharing requirements
  - c. Ability to generate indirect funds

## Recommendation Criteria

1. Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts is the most heavily weighted element of the review. If IM & BI are weak, then it is unlikely the project will be funded.
2. If IM & BI are strong, the alignment with the missions and priorities of NHS/UNC is the next most important criteria.
3. Proposal recommendations from the RSCW advisory board will be, for each proposal: Highly Competitive, Competitive, or Not Competitive.
4. Amount of indirect funds the project has the potential to generate is the final criteria