

How to become a Mini-Grant Program Reviewer **“Your participation is vital for continued program excellence!”**

If you are interested in being a reviewer for the Innovations and Enhancements for a Consortium of Big-Ten University Research and Training Reactors (URTR) Mini-Grant Program applications or planning to submit a proposal application, please read the following to understand how applications will be reviewed.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact:

Mini-Grant Program Secretary, Traci Shimmel, 138 Reber Building, University Park, PA 16802

Phone: 814-863-6383, E-mail at tshimmel@psu.edu.

OVERVIEW OF MINI- GRANT REVIEW PROCESS for 2007-2008 Applications

The complete Mini-Grant review process covers four separate phases:

- **First Phase** - University Research and Training Reactor or Virtual Research and Training Reactor (URTR/VRTR) staff will review each proposal. The basis of their review is as follows:
 1. All applicants must have discussed their grant proposal with a URTR staff person prior to submission. Failure to do so will disqualify the applicant immediately.
 2. Applicants must ensure that the proposal meets URTR/VRTR facility/University safety and security standards, policy and regulations.
 3. Applicants must ensure that costs projected in the proposal are realistic and can be provided at the facility chosen by the applicant.
 4. Comments on the cost/benefit aspect of the grant in meeting the goals and objectives of the Mini-Grant program.
- **Second Phase**. Each proposal will be reviewed by three independent people who are familiar with nuclear science and technology and working in fields such as secondary, higher education, research, utility, industrial, or medical applications.
 1. More details are provided below.
- **Third Phase**. The Mini-Grant Governance Committee will review each proposal and make recommendation to the United States Department of Energy (U.S. DOE) for final approval.
- **Fourth Phase**. The U.S. DOE with the INIE project will comment on Committee's recommendation.

REVIEWERS

WHO-WHAT-HOW-WHY

- This is a voluntary activity.
- Reviewers in the past, have been: radiation safety officers, scientists, science teachers, administrators, researchers, and various medical field professionals.
- Reviewers in the past, have come from colleges and universities, industry, utilities, health and safety businesses, national laboratories, and professional associations.
- A reviewer must be able to use a computer to utilize our on-line review process.
- If an interested reviewer requests a hardcopy, it will be provided.
- Reviewers can complete the review on-line or use other means such as fax or e-mail to report their assessment. Note: On-line evaluations are preferred.
- A reviewer should be fairly knowledgeable in some aspect of nuclear science or technology.
- No reviewer will be given or will be required to review a grant that may be a conflict of interest.
- A reviewer may refuse to assess a specific grant for any reason.
- Each review may receive up to three applications to review from a similar field or category.
- Grant applications are posted and reviewed electronically on a secure web site.
- Each reviewer will be provided a secure path to read and assess each grant.
- The amount of time for each review is approximately 20 minutes.
- If you are interested in being a reviewer please contact:

Mini-Grant Program Secretary, Traci Shimmel, 138 Reber Building,
University Park, PA 16802

Phone: 814-863-6383, E-mail at tshimmel@psu.edu.

OVERVIEW OF REVIEW PROCESS

Once you have been selected as reviewer and the process begins:

- You will be notified by e-mail and provided the following:
 1. Log-on site address
 2. Your ID and password information
 3. The names of the applications you will be asked to review
- Be able to review, score and comment on each application

SCORING PROCESS

Mini-Grant applications are reviewed, scored and commented on from three distinct parts.

Part I.

Scientific and/or technical merit or the educational benefits of the project (zero to 50 points)

- Strengths
- Weaknesses

Comment/Explanation and Numerical Score	
Suggested Scoring Guidelines:	
37-50 points	Outstanding merit; highly innovative, little or no apparent weaknesses or shortcomings.
24-36 points	Reasonable merit; innovative, some weaknesses are evident.
11-23 points	Questionable merit, not very innovative; major weaknesses are evident.
0-10 points	Little or no merit; critical weaknesses.

Part II.

Appropriateness of the proposal method or approach (zero to 50 points)

- Strengths
- Weaknesses

Comment/Explanation and Numerical Score	
Suggested Scoring Guidelines:	
37-50 points	Outstanding approach; highly effective methods; little or no apparent weaknesses.
24-36 points	Reasonable approach; effective methods; some weaknesses are evident.
11-23 points	Questionable approach, ineffective methods; some weaknesses are evident.
0-10 points	Little or no approach; major weaknesses are evident.

Part III.

Cost/Benefit of application

Comment/Explanation and Score by noting one of following:

SATISFACTORY or UNSATISFACTORY

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Reviewers are expected to read and score the application and supporting information of each proposal. Reviewers should not judge the application based upon other factors such as the submitting institution or other matters outside the scope of the individual proposal/application's reviewing guidelines. If you have a problem with any part of this matter, please contact the Mini-Grant Secretary.

TRANSMISSION OF APPLICATION

Copying or transmitting any proposal(s) for any purpose other than the Mini-Grant Program Review process is not allowed.