

# Grant Review Panel Guidelines

## Grant Review Panel's Roles and Responsibilities

Grant review panel (GRP)'s role is to identify the proposal's strengths and weaknesses and determine whether the research will advance knowledge in the field and/or improve health and quality of life.

The GRP's responsibilities include:

- Evaluating individual Requests for Funding Applications.
- Rating each application.
- Discussing applications at a review meeting.

The GRP meets once a year by videoconference to facilitate the review and recommendations on applications.

## Grant Review Panel Member Time Commitment

Service on the CHS Global Partnerships Grant Review Panel is voluntary and requires a time commitment. The maximum amount of time commitment per reviewer is:

- Availability/commitment to attend an orientation call (up to 1 hour long).
- Willingness to serve as a primary reviewer for at least one grant application per year, and secondary reviewer for at least one grant per year.
- Availability/commitment to review and rate grants during our designated review period (August/September).
- Availability/commitment to attend a virtual meeting to discuss reviews and ratings once a year (up to 2 hours).

## Grant Review Process

Full Applications (FA)s will be reviewed by the CHS Global Partnerships Grant Review Panel, with each application reviewed by two Grant Review Panel members, one as primary reviewer and one as secondary reviewer.

## Completing LOE & COI Reviewer Report Form

Reviewer assignment will be based on self-identified level of expertise (LOE) and ensuring there is not a declared conflict of interest (COI).

1. Each reviewers must complete a **GPRI\_Research LOE&COI Form** and submit it to [submit@chsglobalpartnerships.com](mailto:submit@chsglobalpartnerships.com). Email subject line should include “LOE & COI Form.”
2. For each project, reviewers must assign a LOE (high, medium, low or none) and make a declaration, either yes or no, of any conflicts.

### CHS Global Partnerships Conflicts of Interest Policy

*Conflict of Interest exists when a reviewers personal or financial interests affect, or may be perceived to affect, their objectivity. Possible Conflicts of Interest include, but are not limited to the following, where:*

- i. the applicant(s) and reviewer are members in the same academic department or research institution;*
- ii. the applicant(s) and reviewer have had a research collaboration or co-authorship within the past 3 years, or proposed in the immediate future;*
- iii. the applicant(s) and reviewer have had a professional association as a research graduate student, postdoctoral fellow, or supervisor in the past 3 years;*
- iv. the reviewer has a close personal or business relationship with the applicant(s).*

*Reviewers must avoid all real or apparent conflicts by absenting themselves from such discussions and/or evaluations. They will consider potential conflicts with not only the principal applicant, but with all named co-applicants as well. Should the reviewer become aware of a real or apparent conflict, they must make full disclosure of the nature and scope of the conflict, which will be reviewed by the CHS Global Partnerships to determine if prevents the reviewer from participating in the review process. In the event that a conflict of interest is discovered or recognized during the course of the review process, the reviewer will similarly make immediate full disclosure of the nature and scope of this conflict*

## In advance of the FA Review Meeting

1. Upon receipt of all FA, CHS Global Partnership staff will provide to all reviewers:
  - a. All FA submissions, except those where a COI has been declared;
  - b. A list outlining reviewer role assignment (primary or secondary reviewer);
  - c. A Reviewer Report Form template that is to be completed for each application to which reviewer has been assigned the role of primary or secondary reviewer.

2. Using **GPRI\_Research FA\_Reviewer Report Form**, primary and secondary reviewers will provide written reports **for each** assigned application.
  - a. FAs are to be reviewed using the evaluation criteria: relevance, excellence, potential for impact, and feasibility. **Table 1** below provides a description of each evaluation criterion.
  - b. The merit of each application is to be evaluated against the criteria. Preliminary ratings, from 1-5, are to be provided for each of the evaluation criteria.
  - c. A preliminary overall rating must also be assigned. The preliminary overall rating is to be an AVERAGE of the ratings for each of the review criteria.
3. Completed Reviewer Reports are to be submitted to [submit@chsglobalpartnerships.com](mailto:submit@chsglobalpartnerships.com). Email subject line should include “FA Reviewer Reports”.
4. Reports will be anonymized (devoid of reviewer details) and circulated to all Grant Review Panel members at least one day prior to the review meeting in an effort to enhance and expedite panel meeting discussions. Depending on application pressures, applications will be ranked by the average overall ratings prior to the review meeting so that only the top applications in contention for funding will be discussed at the meeting.

**Table 1: Evaluation criteria**

**Relevance**

- Proposed project is in line with the CHS Global Partnerships’ strategic plan and components of this RFA.
- Proposed project addresses a specific, well-defined, priority/question for the Deaf and hard of hearing communities.
- Proposed project is driven by a strong rationale that rests on sufficient evidence. Current state of knowledge relative to the proposed project is included.

**Excellence**

- Proposed project is novel and of international caliber.
- Goals and objectives are well defined and attainable.
- Research design is appropriate to answer the question(s) posed, with a cohesive plan that will lead to meaningful results.

**Table 1: Evaluation criteria**

- Potential pitfalls and possible mitigation plans are provided and appropriate.
- Where applicable, statistical justification is provided to support the hypothesis and project design.

**Potential for Impact**

- Proposed project will have an impact for Deaf and hard of hearing individuals.
- The application articulates a clear path to impact.
- The community engagement plan is appropriate and will contribute to the project meeting the needs of the people intended to benefit.

**Feasibility**

- Proposed project is feasible, within the term of the award, with potential for success.
- The project team has the necessary range of disciplines and experience necessary to conduct the project.
- Project leadership has led or contributed to research and/or innovations that have made contributions to the Research Area(s) of Focus.
- Project deliverables and milestones are attainable within the specified timeline. They are appropriately defined to allow the monitoring of progress against goals and objectives. Appropriate Go/No-go decision points are outlined.