RESEARCH AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT GRANT PROGRAM
EVALUATION CRITERIA

Reviewers will consider each of the following five priority review criteria in the determination of scientific/scholarly and technical merit, and give a separate score for each. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific/scholarly impact. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.

SIGNIFICANCE
Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field/discipline?

INVESTIGATOR(S)
Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If Early Stage Investigators or New Investigators, or in the early stages of independent careers, do they have appropriate experience and training? If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? If the project is collaborative or multi-PD/PI, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance and organizational structure appropriate for the project?

INNOVATION
Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?

APPROACH
Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility and will particularly risky aspects be managed? If the project involves empirical or clinical research, are the plans for 1) protection of human subjects from research risks, and 2) inclusion of minorities and members of both sexes/genders, as well as the inclusion of children, justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed?

ENVIRONMENT
Will the scientific/scholarly environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Are the institutional support, equipment and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed? Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?

NOTE: A proposal may be designated **Not Recommended for Further Consideration (NRFC)** if it lacks significant and substantial merit; presents serious ethical problems in the protection of human subjects from research risks; or presents serious ethical problems in the use of vertebrate animals, biohazards, and/or select agents.

- Adapted from the NIH Review Criteria for Research Proposals