



2020-2021 VPR Research & Creative Grants Review Instructions

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for the VPR Research and Creative Grants (RGC). Your time will help to provide support of up to \$10,000 for worthy projects for each selected UT faculty member.

The program's overall objectives are to promote research, outreach, and creative activities in all disciplines that will result in publications, patents, recognition, awards, or exhibitions/performances appropriate to the PI's discipline, and/or will improve competitiveness for external funding.

With this year's increase in available funding comes a decrease in the number of awards. This year we expect to award 10-12 projects across all five review panels. Our hope that by reviewing in panels, each proposal will be reviewed by faculty with a clearer understand of the standards in each general area and will be better able to select the best proposals.

When reviewing the proposals, please follow these instructions:

1. You will be asked to review applications from only the panel you selected. Applicants have been asked to select an appropriate review panel, as well.
2. Since you are reviewing applications from only one of five groups, we ask that you review applications not so much one against another, but one against the standards. We would like you to review your assigned proposals for the relative strength of each these factors:
 - Intrinsic, scientific, scholarly, or creative excellence of the work.
 - Evidence of work plan soundness and investigator's ability to carry out the project.
 - Importance of proposed work to the knowledge of the discipline.
 - Impact on the completion of the scholar's creative activity. How much will this funding make the project better? How much will this impact the project?
 - Likelihood of obtaining external funding and/or generating activities consistent with the highest standards of the discipline will be given the highest priority.
 - A clearly-defined plan for using RGC funding to leverage future funding (for fields where external funding is likely).
3. Each panel will provide scores and comments using the following scoring scale:

- Outstanding (Point value: 5): Vitally important project undertaken by a qualified investigator who can be expected to make substantial progress and has potential for generating activities consistent with the highest standards of the discipline. This rating should be reserved for truly excellent proposals and should be rare, but should be used when warranted. *It's best to think of this as a four-point scale, reserving the score of five for the rare, truly exceptional, proposal.*
 - Excellent (Point Value: 4): Proposal considered superior, both for the intrinsic merit of the project and the ability of the investigator. Should be supported.
 - Very Good (Point Value 3): Proposal considered superior, both for the intrinsic merit of the project and the ability of the investigator. Should be fully or partially supported with recommendation for scope or budgetary adjustment.
 - Good (Point Value: 2): Worthwhile project by a competent investigator, but routine in nature. May be supported if funds are available.
 - Fair (Point Value: 1): Proposal has serious deficiencies that decrease the probability of successful completion. Might merit consideration in future competitions if resubmitted with major changes.
 - Poor (Point Value 0): Clearly not deserving of support or is written in language that prohibits adequate merit evaluation by reviewers.
4. There will be five questions: four specific topic questions and one on the proposal as a whole. For each question, please rate according to the five-point scale above and make any comments to the applicant and administrators you feel to be useful and appropriate.
 5. Your objective review of these applications is important. Please do your best to avoid all biases in both your reviews and comments to the applicants or administrators. This includes not only academic and personal biases, but also those with regard to sex, race, color, age, national origin, religion, disability, citizenship status, Vietnam Era or special disabled veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.

Thank you again for your help with these reviews.