Guidelines for Proposal Evaluation

Committee Members
According to the University Research Board’s (URB) policy guidelines for faculty research grants, the Faculty Research Committee (FRC) must review, evaluate and approve all grant applications. The following describes the process of review and evaluation of proposals followed by the FRC.

1. All applications must meet the eligibility (and other) requirements of faculty research grants as stipulated in the URB Guidelines at http://staff.aub.edu.lb/~webgrant/urb/guidelines.htm

2. All applications should include the Office of Grants and Contracts cover sheet at http://staff.aub.edu.lb/~webgrant/forms.htm signed by the Department Chairperson, and a covering letter addressed to the FRC Chairperson.

3. There is no specific format required for proposals submitted to URB grants, but proposals must be typewritten (preferably in MS word), and must include the following items:
   • Covering page, including title of the proposed project, applicant’s name and email address, departmental affiliation, and total amount requested.
   • Summary of project of no more than one page.
   • Project description of no more than 10 pages (double spaced). The description may include the objectives and significance of the project, materials and methods of analysis, relation to current research in the field (a concise literature review).
   • Bibliography
   • Itemized budget and work plan
   • Statement of any current or potential funding sources (with amounts requested).
   • CV of main investigator

4. The PI should submit a hard copy of the complete application to the Chairperson of the FRC at least eight* weeks prior to the deadline set by the URB.

5. The Chairperson of the FRC screens each application to determine eligibility and to ensure that it meets the minimal requirements as described in the URB written guidelines and the FRC instructions as described above. Incomplete proposals and/or those that require significant editing will be returned to the PI within a week after submission for revisions.

6. After the initial screening by the FRC Chairperson, the original of the complete application must be submitted to the Chairperson of the FRC at least six* weeks prior to the deadline set by the URB. The PI must also submit an electronic version of their proposals to the Chairperson of the FRC.

7. Two members of the FRC will be designated as principal internal reviewers of each proposal and will complete the FRC standardized Evaluation Form prior to the Committee deliberation.

8. The PI may propose names for the external reviewer, and the Chairperson of the FRC will select the external reviewer in consultation with members of the FRC. The FRC will then seek the opinion of the external reviewer to (anonymously) evaluate the proposal according to the FRC Evaluation Form, and to give an overall evaluation score of the application (1. Strongly recommended, 2. Highly recommended, 3. Recommended, or 4. Non-recommended).

9. All members of the FRC will review all proposals and participate in the deliberations of each one (other than their own, if any). The external and internal reviews as well as the deliberations within the FRC should be complete within a period of three weeks.

10. The FRC, after discussing the reviewers’ comments (two internal and one external), will send the reviewers’ comments to the PI within at least three* weeks prior to the deadline set by the URB and
ask the investigator to respond to the reviewers’ concerns and submit a revised electronic version of
the proposal at least one week prior to the deadline set by the URB.

11. The FRC will study the revised version of the proposal in light of the reviewers’ comments and will
assign a priority score based on (1) the reviewers’ recommendations, (2) the track record of the
investigator, and (3) an anonymous voting by all members of the FRC, excluding those who are
submitting proposals as PIs.

* The time frames set are related to the regular funding cycle of Research Grants (Spring)