

02.pdf

## Application & Review Process – RIFP and Other SON

### RIFP

list of 2 items

- Applications for Research and Intramural Funding are managed according to the RIFP schedule posted and are reviewed for scientific merit by the Research

and Intramural Funding Program Review Committee.

- Funding decisions are made by the Research and Intramural Funding Program Executive Committee. Management of RIFP grants is provided by the Office for

Nursing Research.

list end

### Other SON

list of 2 items

- Applications for School of Nursing Funding from other sources that may be announced as part of the Call for RIFP Proposals also are managed according

to the RIFP schedule posted and are reviewed for scientific merit by the Research and Intramural Funding Program Review Committee.

- Funding decisions and management of the grants are the responsibility of the Center or Department providing the funds.

list end

### Purpose, Eligibility and Award Amount May Differ

The purpose, eligibility, and award amount of RIFP grants and other SON grants may differ. Please refer to the specific requirements for each funding type announced in the Call for RIFP Proposals.

### Application Process is the Same

The application process for RIFP grants and other SON grants announced in the Call for RIFP Proposals is the same with regard to application dates and location, elements, formatting, and copies required. For complete instruction please refer to the following:

list of 3 items

- Application Content & Format Document
- Application Deadline & Copies Document
- Templates (for Cover, Budget, and each category of the application)

list end

Review Process is the Same

A competitive review of proposals submitted for intramural funding is carried out by the Research and Intramural Funding Program Review Committee.

The Reviewers

The Research and Intramural Funding Review Committee consists of faculty members from the School of Nursing, appointed by the Faculty Council on the basis of expressed interest and expertise. Ex-officio members are the Associate Dean for Research and a statistician from the Office for Nursing Research.

Each application is sent to all members of the Research and Intramural Funding Review Committee for general review. Primary and secondary reviewers are assigned to each proposal by the Research and Intramural Funding Program Review Committee Chair and the Associate Dean for Research, who will make the best possible match of reviewers and proposals based on reviewer expertise. The primary and secondary reviewers will remain anonymous to the applicants. Applicants are not to contact members of the Research and Intramural Funding Program Review Committee regarding their reviews, and reviewers may not contact investigators prior to or after the review process.

The Critiques

The information for the scientific review is an abbreviated version of the information required for any federal or philanthropic grant review process.

Research and Intramural Funding Program Review Committee members use these guidelines

when writing their critiques:

1. Aims
2. Significance for nursing theory development and clinical practice
3. Methods appropriately developed and adequately explained:
  - a. Sampling, measurement, data collection and analysis
  - b. Time table and plans for preparing extramural proposal
4. PI qualifications:
  - a. Developmental potential for the future
  - b. Lists consultants if appropriate
5. Budget realistic and sufficiently justified
6. Summarize the strengths and weaknesses of this proposal so that they may be shared with the Principal Investigator.

Critiques are distributed to all committee members before the meeting, and become part of the feedback to the applicant.

#### The Meeting

During the meeting, the primary and secondary reviewers present an oral summary of their written critiques. Other Committee members follow with their oral critiques and comments. The Associate Dean and a Biostatistician from the Office for Nursing Research attend these meetings and, if requested, may provide clarification on the proposal. Neither the Associate Dean nor the Biostatistician participates in the decision-making process or the vote.

Following discussion of the proposals, members determine whether or not a proposal is:

list of 3 items

1. Approved for funding consideration
2. Approved with Contingencies (the contingencies are written and voted on by committee members, and are clearly stated and approved by the Associate Dean)

3. Not recommended for further consideration.

list end

The latter recommendation is given when the study cannot be conducted as proposed or there is no scientific merit to the proposal. Only those proposals that have been “Approved” or “Approved with Contingencies” are then given a priority rating.

The applications are rated numerically from 1.0 to 5.0 with only one decimal.

Outstanding 1.0 – 1.5

Excellent 1.5 – 2.0

Very Good 2.0 – 2.5

Good 2.5 – 3.5

Acceptable 3.5 – 5.0

The priority rating is based on significance of the proposed research and scientific merit of the proposal. These ratings are totaled and averaged confidentially following the Review Committee meeting and presented to the appropriate Executive Committees for funding consideration.