

Criteria for Judging  
Equipment and Infrastructure Enhancement Grant Proposals

---

-- COMMITTEE REVIEWER CRITERIA --

Below are the criteria each member of the CRC Equipment and Infrastructure Enhancement Grant (EIEG) Review Committee will use to assist them in (a) critiquing a proposal, (b) providing useful feedback to the PI, and (c) determining an overall score for the proposal.

*\*\*Keep in mind that each section of the proposal text should be written in clear, concise language so that reviewers from any discipline will be able to understand what is being stated.\*\**

- **Project / Issue and Goals:**  
Is the project or issue that the proposed equipment/infrastructure enhancement or service contract will address important or significant in the PI and Co-PI(s)' area(s) of research? Are the goals/objectives of this equipment or infrastructure enhancement clear? Does the equipment already exist on campus?
- **Research Methods/Creative Activities:**  
Referring to the goals/objectives proposed, do the research methods and/or creative activities and the identified multidisciplinary users seem appropriate?
- **Broader Impacts:**  
Do the intended outcomes of this equipment or infrastructure enhancement have a direct contribution to a new tangible public benefit, beyond its research goals?
- **Funding Information:**  
Does the explanation of why this equipment, tool, or service contract has not been previously funded seem reasonable? If applicable, is it likely that their plans and probability assessment for receiving external matching are accurate and achievable?
- **Budget:**  
Referencing this proposal's goals and objectives and the type of equipment/infrastructure enhancement/service contract proposed, does the detailed quotation from the vendor seem reasonable? Are the PI's and Co-PI(s)' departments contributing cost share?
- **Management of the Equipment:**  
Does the proposal describe who will be responsible for the extraneous expenses, such as installation, operation, repairs, maintenance, and replacement of the equipment or tool? Are the plans for the maintenance of this equipment or infrastructure enhancement equitable and accessible? Is cost-sharing involved in these expenses? If a service contract is proposed, are the details of what the contract will and will not cover outlined?
- **Impact of Previous EIEG Awards:**  
Have the PI and Co-PI(s) used previous EIEG awards as proposed? Is the equipment still actively used and properly maintained?

## -- PROGRAM COORDINATOR CRITERIA --

Below are the criteria the CRC Program Coordinator will use to review each proposal. If any of these criteria are not met, the proposal will not be reviewed by the CRC Equipment and Infrastructure Enhancement Grant Review Committee and will not be eligible for funding. The CRC AHPEG Review Committee will not need to review the following items:

- Eligibility
  - Is the PI eligible to apply for a CRC Equipment and Infrastructure Enhancement Grant?
- Proposal Submission
  - Has the PI correctly completed all of the required forms?
  - Was the Proposal Transmittal form properly completed within the portal? Have the Co-PI(s) and their departments been indicated in the portal?
  - Does the Proposal Text include all of the required sections? Is each section properly titled and numbered? Is the length of the proposal text no more than 8 pages (not counting appendices)?
  - Has the Past, Current, & Pending Grants section if the portal been properly completed?
  - Has the Proposal Budget been properly completed? Is the proposed use of the award funds acceptable in light of the funding rules for this grant program? Have cost sharing or support documents been uploaded?
  - Have the Curricula Vitae for the PI and Co-PI(s) been properly completed?
  - Did the PI submit the proposal in time to meet the submission deadline? Did the Chair(s) and Dean(s) approve the proposal by their approval deadline?