Faculty of Health Studies and Centre for Critical Studies of Rural Mental Health Grant

Peer Review Manual

Health Studies Research Grant Review Process

a) Grant applications can be received by the Research Facilitator for review up to one week prior to the deadline date. This allows for an opportunity for the applications to be reviewed by the Research Facilitator. The Research Facilitator will review for completeness and suggest changes and additions if the application is incomplete.

b) Final grant applications must be received by the Research Facilitator by the deadline date.

c) Research Facilitator forwards completed applications to the Review Committee members.

d) Review Committee members review the application according to the review template.

e) Review Committee members send their completed review templates and recommendations to the Research Facilitator.

f) The Research Facilitator schedules a meeting of Review Committee.

g) Applications are adjudicated at a Review Committee meeting and a recommendation made to the Dean.

h) Applications will be approved, rejected with an invitation to revise and resubmit, or rejected. If an application is rejected, the Review Committee will provide the rationale. If rejected with an invitation to revise and resubmit, review comments will be provided to the applicant.

i) If an application is revised and resubmitted, two reviewers will review the revised proposal and will either approve or reject based on how well the requested revisions were addressed.

j) Applicants will be notified of the decision by the Dean.

k) Successful applicants must submit a copy of the Ethics Certificate from the Brandon University Ethics Committee prior to accessing funds. (Within 6 months notification of successful application).

l) A final project report and a statement of expenditures must be provided to the Review Committee within one month of the expiry of the grant (two years and one month following acceptance letter). It is expected that the researcher will book a presentation at a Health Studies Seminar Series.

m) The Research Facilitator will confirm that the researcher has delivered a presentation at a Health Studies seminar series within 6 months of completion of the project.

n) The file will be closed.

Timeline for Health Studies Research Grant Application

Activity	Minimum of 1 week prior to deadline	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4
Application can be reviewed by Research Facilitator for feedback	X				
Application sent out to Review Committee		X			
Review Committee members return completed review template and recommendations to the Research Facilitator				X	
Review Committee meet to adjudicate applications and a recommendation is made to the Dean				X	
Applicant is notified of decision					X

Faculty of Health Studies
and Centre for Critical Studies of
Rural Mental Health Grant
Research Grant Review Committee: Assessment Form 2017

Please note that copies of your assessment form will be shared with applicants (with the exception of reviewer name, final scoring and ranking- which will be blacked-out), so please ensure that your assessment, including strengths and weaknesses, is provided in a constructive manner.

Reviewer Name:

Applicant Name(s):

Project Title:

EVALUATION CRITERIA:	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A
1. Concept 1.1 Significance and impact of the research (1 page) (25% of score)						
2. Feasibility (75%) 2.1 Approach and Methods (50%) (design and plan, including how and when the project will be completed, dissemination plan, and fit with applicant's research program) (3 pages)						
2.2 Expertise, Experience, Roles and Resources/Partnerships (1 page) (25% of score)						
Rationale/comments:						

Faculty of Health Studies
and Centre for Critical Studies of
Rural Mental Health Grant

Sub criteria to use to measure each criterion

Criterion 1: Concept

- Is the project idea creative?
- Is the rationale of the project sound?
- Are the overall goals and objectives of the project well defined?
- Are the anticipated project contributions likely to advance health-related knowledge, health care, health systems and/or health outcomes?

Criterion 2: Feasibility

2.1 Approaches and Methods

- Are the approaches and methods appropriate to deliver the proposed output(s) and achieve the proposed contribution(s) to advancing health-related knowledge, health care, health systems, and/or health outcomes?
- Are the timelines and related deliverables of the project realistic?
- Does the proposal identify potential challenges and appropriate mitigation strategies?
- Is a dissemination plan included?
- Does the research relate to the applicant's research program?

2.2 Expertise, Experience, and Resources

- Does the applicant(s) bring the appropriate expertise and experience to lead and deliver the proposed output(s), and to achieve the proposed contribution(s)?
- What are the roles of each researcher?
- What resources and/or partnerships are brought to the project?
- Is there an appropriate level of engagement and/or commitment from the applicant(s)?

Criteria	Score
1. Concept	
1.1 Quality/Importance of the idea	___/25
2. Feasibility	
2.1 Approaches and Methods, dissemination plan, fit with research program	___/50
2.2 Expertise, Experience, Roles and Resources/Partnerships	___/25
3. Budget* Is budget fully justified and required to conduct the proposed research?	Yes/No
Total Score	___/100

*Budget assessment
  a) Is the requested funding appropriate to support the project?
  b) Is the budget realistic and well-justified, taking into account any other sources of funding?

Overall Assessment

In establishing a final score of this application, consider the following rating scale:
Excellent (90-100)   Very Good (70-89)   Good (50-69)   Fair (30-49)   Poor (10-29).

Application rating score_____(indicate **a single numeric** value from 1-100 where 1 is poor and 100 is excellent. Please do not use a range (e.g. 70-80)).

Applications that have a score of below 50 will not be considered for funding.
Applications that have a score of 50-69 may be asked to revise their proposal before funding or may be rejected.
Applications with Excellent to Very Good Scores will be funded. When applications exceed the funding envelope, the applications with the higher scores will be funded.

Additional comments (Please provide additional comments related to strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, and significance of the research). **Please note that your comments below will be shared with applicants so please ensure that your assessment, including strengths and weaknesses, is provided in a constructive manner.**