

Procedure for Merit Review of ISRC and TLT Proposals
Office of Academic Affairs
New York Institute of Technology

Rev. 10/29/21

Please note that by agreeing to serve on the ISRC-TLT Review Committee, members consent to sign a confidentiality agreement (Exhibit A) under which they agree to keep:

- **All proposals confidential**
- **All proposal reviews and deliberations/discussions confidential**
- **All proposal scores confidential**
- **All ideas and potential intellectual property contained in these proposals confidential**

Proposals received by NYIT's Office of Sponsored Programs and Research (OSPAR) are checked by OSPAR staff for completeness and conformance with ISRC and TLT Program guidelines, and the budgets are checked for accuracy. All proposals deemed ready for review are then routed to members of the ISRC-TLT Review Committee for peer review. Committee recommendations are made to the Provost by the Chair, and the Provost makes final funding decisions.

Funding Priorities

Priority will be given to high quality proposals submitted by new investigators and/or investigators conducting highly innovative work that represents a significant change in research direction or tests new methods or techniques.

Review Process

Every effort is made to conduct an impartial, competitive, and transparent merit-review process. All ISRC-TLT proposals are evaluated through the use of specified merit review criteria. Each criterion includes suggested considerations that help to define it. While not all of these considerations will apply to any given proposal, reviewers are asked to address those considerations that are relevant to the proposal at hand and for which the reviewer is qualified to make judgments. Reviewers unqualified to review a particular proposal, due to a conflict of interest, are required to recuse themselves from deliberating, and scoring that proposal. Review Committee members are appointed by the Provost, both for their specialized knowledge of their respective fields, and for their general knowledge, including their familiarity with the different scholarly, creative, and pedagogical approaches that are practiced at NYIT, and knowledge of the grants arena. While committee selection is designed to ensure that all proposals receive conscientious review by experts who can make recommendations in accordance with specified review criteria, it is recognized that non-specialist reviewers can provide vital perspectives on proposals outside their particular fields. Therefore, absent any conflict, Review Committee members are expected to evaluate, and vote on, most proposals.

Each Review Committee member is expected to review all proposals received (a total of 43 proposals were received for the 2021 round) in advance of the Review Committee meeting. Before the review meeting, Review Committee members will be provided with copies in PDF of all proposals received. The Reviewers are expected to (a) read all proposals; (b) score each proposal according to a new metric rubric; (c) provide substantive comments, (d) discuss each proposal at the Zoom meeting on February 11, 2022 and (e) e-mail your completed scores and comments to grants@nyit.edu , **shortly after the Review Meeting, but no later than Tuesday February 22, 2022.**

At the Review Committee meeting, which will be held on **Friday, February 11, 2022**, the Chair will invite comments for and against each proposal. Reviewers will no longer vote, but will send their individual comments along with their numerical scores, after the review meeting.

Committee members are expected to remain present at the review meeting until deliberations have been completed. If more time is required, additional review meetings will be convened.

Summary Statements will be prepared by OSPAR and the Chair, who will transmit these to the Provost with the Review Committee's recommendations and the final budgets prepared by OSPAR. The Provost will then make funding decisions; OSPAR will prepare award and declination letters to all applicants; and a decision letter, budget, and Summary Statement (with reviewers' names redacted) will be e-mailed to each PI and Co-PI.

Appeals of Initial Review

Proposals are privileged communications that cannot be shown to or discussed with unauthorized individuals. Reviewers will respect the privacy of the investigators' ideas and intellectual property. Any PI who believes that the review of his/her proposal was procedurally flawed, and who wishes to contest his/her score and/or funding decision, may do so by writing a letter of appeal to the Provost within 30 days of the date of issuance of the summary statement. The appeal letter should (a) describe the flaws in the review process for the proposal in question, (b) explain the reasons for the appeal, and (c) present evidence for either (i) bias on the part of one or more peer reviewers, (ii) conflict of interest, (iii) lack of appropriate expertise within the Review Committee, and (iv) factual errors on the part of one or more reviewers, that could have altered the outcome of review. The Provost will consult with the Review Committee Chair and with other parties as needed, and will make a final determination.

Scoring Methodology

During and after the Review Committee meeting, the Reviewers will prepare brief but substantive written comments, and assign a score to each rubric listed on the Review Form for that proposal.

Reviewers will consider points depending on the questions listed in the Rubric on the next two pages dependent on which grant the PI is applying for, ISRC or TLT. A proposal need not be strong in all categories in order to be judged meritorious/fundable. Providing scores without providing comments in the review critique will jeopardize the use of the review.

ISRC 2022 REVIEW FORM		
PI:		
CoPI:		
Application Type: ISRC		
Project Title:		
Reviewer:		
FUNDING PRIORITIES		
Whole Number Only	<i>Priority will be given to high quality proposals submitted by new investigators and/or investigators conducting highly innovative work that represents a significant change in research direction or tests new methods or techniques.</i>	
0 to number of points allotted per question	REVIEWER COMMENTS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	
	<i>ex. Excellent proposal</i>	
	MERIT REVIEW CRITERIA	COMMENTS
<i>Example:</i>		
10	Budget (including Budget Narrative) (10 points)	
	<i>Does the budget seem reasonable?</i>	
20	Proposed Scholarly Activity (20 points)	
	<i>Does the PI explain the (i) the Significance, (ii) the Intellectual Merit, and (iii) the Broader Impacts of the project? Is this innovative or advance the field? Does this enhance NYIT's reputation? Does this project align with NYIT's vision and mission? If so does NYIT have the resources to support this project? (training, technology or software, IT support, budget, etc.)</i>	
15	Target Population (15 points)	
	<i>Does this involve graduate and/or undergraduate students? If this is a creative work is there a role that a student could play in collecting information, providing social media services, researching background information and/ or shadowing so that they can learn the process of creating such work for example writing a book or creating a piece of work to display? Does this activity broaden the participation of underrepresented (gender, ethnic, disabled, etc groups?) And/or is this project multi-disciplinary/cross-disciplinary and or have a mix of Junior and Senior faculty?</i>	
15	Statement of Objectives and Outcomes (15 points)	
	<i>Does this proposal have a clear objective? Does it meet the objectives described and the intended outcomes? How well conceived is the methodology? Does the project address an important problem or critical barrier to progress in the field?</i>	
15	Assessment Plan (15 points)	
	<i>Are outcomes indicated so that the plan can be assessed?</i>	
5	Prior Experience (5 points)	
	<i>Does the PI have prior experience and/or qualified for this proposal?</i>	
10	Implementation Plan and Timetable (10points)	
	<i>Is the timeline reasonable? Are there checkpoints, milestones, to make sure the project is on track?</i>	
5	Dissemination Plan (5 points)	
	<i>Does the PI have plans to disseminate the information? Is this a significant creative scholarly work, such as a book, major art exhibit, etc?</i>	
5	Long Term sustainability and Future Goals (5 points)	
	<i>Could this preliminary research result in submission for a major external grant proposal?</i>	
100	TOTAL	

TLT 2022 REVIEW FORM		
PI:		
CoPI:		
Application Type: TLT		
Project Title:		
Reviewer:		
FUNDING PRIORITIES		
Whole Number Only	<i>Priority will be given to high quality proposals submitted by new investigators and/or investigators conducting highly innovative work that represents a significant change in research direction or tests new methods or techniques.</i>	
0 to number of points allotted per question	REVIEWER COMMENTS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT:	
	<i>ex. Excellent proposal</i>	
	MERIT REVIEW CRITERIA	COMMENTS
Example:		
10	Budget (including Budget Narrative) (10 points)	
	<i>Does the budget seem reasonable?</i>	
20	Proposed Scholarly Activity (20 points)	
	<i>Does the PI explain the (i) the Significance, (ii) the Intellectual Merit, and (iii) the Broader Impacts of the project? Is this technology use innovative or advance the field? Does this enhance NYIT's reputation? Does this project align with NYIT's vision and mission? If so does NYIT have the resources to support this project? (training, technology or software, IT support, budget, etc.)</i>	
15	Target Population (15 points)	
	<i>Does this include technological curriculum development? Does this technology enhance the learning of the student? Does it have application to a broader group?</i>	
15	Statement of Objectives and Outcomes (15 points)	
	<i>Does this proposal meet the objectives described and the intended outcomes? Does it include information on how the proposed scholarly activity will enhance student learning or impact their experience at NYIT? What is the outcome they are looking to achieve and can it be completed?</i>	
15	Assessment Plan (15 points)	
	<i>Are outcomes indicated so that the plan can be assessed? Can student learning gains be measured? Is there an assessment strategy or technique from salgsite.net described? Do you see any limitations or challenges?</i>	
5	Prior Experience (5 points)	
	<i>Does the PI have prior experience and/or qualified for this proposal? Or have a vision that can be implemented?</i>	
10	Implementation Plan and Timetable (10points)	
	<i>Is a reasonable timetable included? Are there checkpoints, milestones, to make sure the project is on track?</i>	
5	Dissemination Plan (5 points)	
	<i>Does the PI have plans to disseminate the information?</i>	
5	Long Term sustainability and Future Goals (5 points)- is there a future for this proposal?	
	<i>Is there a future for this proposal? Can this project be piloted and shared across disciplines? Within the department, or for a broader audience?</i>	
100	TOTAL	

Exhibit A

ISRC/TLT Grant Proposal Review
Proposal Reviewer Work and Confidentiality Agreement

The undersigned reviewer agrees to adhere to the following scope of work, confidentiality, and conflict of interest requirements in connection with ISRC/TLT Grant Proposal Review managed by the Office of Sponsored Programs and Research (OSPAR) of the New York Institute of Technology.

I. Scope of Work

- a) Before reviewing or scoring any grant proposal, carefully read the evaluation criteria, the explanations thereof and the instructions for scoring, all of which will be provided along with a PDF copy of the proposal;
- b) Carefully review the whole of each grant proposal transmitted pursuant to this agreement;
- c) In accordance with the priorities, criteria, explanations and instructions, solely on the basis thereof and of the content of the grant proposal, score each grant proposal;
- d) Score each proposal according to the rubrics; provide substantive comments to support such scores; and return the scores and comments to the OSPAR Representative in a timely manner.

II. Confidentiality

OSPAR requires each reviewer to treat proposals with strict confidence before, during, and after the review process. Except for panel discussions, reviewers are not to discuss information contained in the proposals or learned during panel meetings with anyone not included in the immediate panel. Reviewers are allowed to reproduce grant materials for the purpose of the proposal review. I understand and agree the maintenance of confidentiality also includes the destruction of confidential review materials at the conclusion of the review session. This includes any printed copies of the proposals, notes from the proposal review and all other confidential information in my possession. I also acknowledge that OSPAR will not cover or provide reimbursement for printing and disposal expenses incurred by the Reviewer.

III. Conflict of Interest

Conflict of interest is defined as any action by a reviewer in the grants review or awarding process which would affect, or could appear to affect, the reviewer's financial interest; or would cause the reviewer's impartiality in the grants process to be questioned. Based on the information provided to me, I do not have a conflict of interest in any of the proposals. If during the review there is an appearance of or actual conflict of interest, I will recuse myself from the review of that proposal.

Panel Member:

Signature:
Please Print Name:

Date: