**KU Research GO Reviewer Rubric + Feedback Form**

**Applicant:**

**Project Title:**

**Reviewer Name:**

**SECTION 1: Review Criteria**

Evaluate each criterion on the scale defined in the rubric and explain your choice. *Reviewer comments will be shared with the review panel and the applicant.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Strong (1)** | **Satisfactory (2)** | **Developing (3)** |
| **Merit of Proposed Work:** The research idea and associated research plan are new and advance scholarship within the field of study. | The research idea and research plan are significantly novel and have a high likelihood of advancing scholarship within the field of study. | The research idea and research plan are somewhat new and have the potential to advance scholarship within the field of study. | The research idea and research plan are not yet sufficiently novel and are unlikely to advance scholarship within the field of study. |

**Assessment:** \_\_\_Strong (1)      \_\_\_Satisfactory (2)      \_\_\_Developing (3) (type an X on the line before your score)

**Explain:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Strong (1)** | **Satisfactory (2)** | **Developing (3)** |
| **External Funding:** The proposal outlines an external funding opportunity and sufficiently justifies how internal funding would aid its pursuit. | The proposal outlines one or more specific funding opportunities, and there is high likelihood the proposed research will make an external competition more competitive. | The proposal may outline one or more specific funding opportunities. There is a possibility it could lead to an external grant proposal, but its competitiveness should be improved. | The proposal fails to outline one or more specific funding opportunities. Consequently, it is also unlikely this project would lead to a competitive external proposal. |

**Assessment:** \_\_\_Strong (1)      \_\_\_Satisfactory (2)      \_\_\_Developing (3)  (type an X on the line before your score)

**Explain:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Strong (1)** | **Satisfactory (2)** | **Developing (3)** |
| **Feasibility:** The proposed research plan can be performed within the budget and timeline necessary to pursue the identified external funding opportunity. | There is high confidence the research plan can be performed within the proposed budget and timeline, and there is little to no doubt it will result in a successful proposal for external funding. | It will be challenging for the research plan to be performed within the proposed budget and timeline. More clarity should be provided to support the likelihood of the research resulting in external funding. | It is unlikely the research plan can be performed within the proposed budget and timeline. Consequently, it is also unlikely to result in external funding. |

**Assessment:** \_\_\_Strong (1)      \_\_\_Satisfactory (2)      \_\_\_Developing (3)   (type an X on the line before your score)

**Explain:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Strong (1)** | **Satisfactory (2)** | **Developing (3)** |
| **PI’s research record.** The PI’s record of previous scholarship is appropriate for the proposed research. | There is high confidence that the PI is well-qualified to complete the proposed project based on their research record. | It will be challenging for the PI to complete the proposed research based on their research record. | It is unlikely the PI has the qualifications necessary to complete the proposed project based on their research record. |

**Assessment:** \_\_\_Strong (1)      \_\_\_Satisfactory (2)      \_\_\_Developing (3)  (type an X on the line before your score)

**Explain:**

**SECTION 2: Summary Recommendation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation for funding:** Based on the above elements together, the project is likely to achieve its stated goals for a scholarship product (i.e. publication or proposal). | **Fund this proposal (1):** Most elements received a “Strong” rating; any elements with a “Satisfactory” rating  can be easily improved.  ***Add feedback below.*** | **Consider this proposal (2):** Some elements were rated “Strong,” but others were  rated “Satisfactory,” indicating some areas that need further development. With feedback,  the applicant could improve  the project plan. ***Add feedback below.*** | **Do not fund this proposal in  its current form (3):** The proposal does not align with the programmatic goals of Research GO, or several of the elements above were rated as  “Developing.” With feedback, the applicant could revise the project plan for consideration  in future grant cycles. ***Add feedback below.*** |

**Recommendation:**       \_\_\_Fund this proposal (1)      \_\_\_Consider this proposal (2)      \_\_\_Do not fund this proposal in its current form (3)

**Explain:**

**SECTION 3:** List the strengths and weaknesses of this proposal, including recommendations for improvements to the project plan that applicants could incorporate for consideration in future grant cycles. Please support your comments with citations from the proposal narrative and/or CVs presented by the applicant. *Reviewer comments will be shared with the review panel and the applicant.*

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses/Recommended Improvements:**

**Total Score (5-15):**

*5 = most competitive for external funding  
15 = least competitive for external funding*