**KU Racial Equity Award Reviewer Rubric + Feedback Form**

**Applicant: Added during phase 2 of dual-anonymous review**

**Project Title:**

**Reviewer Name:**

**SECTION 1: Review Criteria**

Evaluate each criterion on the scale defined in the rubric and explain your choice. *Comments in this section will be shared with the review panel and the applicants.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Strong** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing** |
| **Merit and degree of novelty/innovation of proposed work.** The project fosters progress toward racial equity (as defined in the program description), clearly defining metrics and outcomes for success and using approaches that are novel, innovative and/or inventive that build upon KU’s existing work and resources in the area rather than duplicate them. | The project will significantly foster progress toward racial equity based on clearly defined metrics and outcomes for success, using approaches that are novel, innovative and/or inventive and that build upon KU’s existing work and resources in the area. | The project will somewhat foster progress toward racial equity based on metrics and outcomes that are clearly defined and using approaches that are novel, innovative and/or inventive and that build upon KU’s existing work and resources in the area. | The project is unlikely to foster progress toward racial equity and/or does not clearly define metrics and outcomes for success, use approaches that are novel, innovative and/or inventive, or build upon KU’s existing work and resources in this area rather than duplicate them. |

**Assessment:** \_\_\_Strong \_\_\_Satisfactory \_\_\_Developing (type an X on the line before your score)

**Explain:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Strong** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing** |
| **Feasibility.** The project is feasible given the proposed scope, budget, participants, timeline and metrics for success. | The research team can achieve the project’s metrics for success within the proposed timeline and budget; the planned expenditures logically support and are necessary for the planned work. | It will be challenging for the research team to achieve the project’s metrics for success without additional time or funding; the planned expenditures might logically support the planned work, but require more detail or justification. | It is unlikely that the research team can achieve the project’s metrics for success within the proposed timeline and budget; the planned expenditures do not logically support or are not necessary for the planned work. |

**Assessment:** \_\_\_Strong \_\_\_Satisfactory \_\_\_Developing (type an X on the line before your score)

**Explain:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Strong** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing** |
| **Evidence of the PI(s)’ capacity  to lead the proposed work.**  The principal investigator(s) demonstrate current research strength and capacity in the proposed area and have assembled a project team that provides adequate support and expertise for the proposed project. | PIs demonstrate sufficient research strength and capacity  in the proposed area and have assembled a suitably sized and/or qualified support team (where applicable) to complete the proposed project. | PIs demonstrate sufficient research strength and capacity  in the proposed area but have  not assembled a suitably sized and/or qualified support team (where applicable) to complete the proposed project; OR PIs demonstrate limited research strength and capacity in the proposed area. | PIs do not demonstrate  sufficient research strength  and capacity in the proposed  area and have not assembled  a suitably sized and/or  qualified support team  (where applicable) to  complete the proposed  project. |

**Assessment:** \_\_\_Strong \_\_\_Satisfactory \_\_\_Developing (type an X on the line before your score)

**Explain:**

**SECTION 2: Summary Recommendation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation for funding:** Based on the above elements together, the project is likely to achieve its stated goals for advancing progress toward  racial equity within the award period. | **Fund this proposal:** Most elements received a “Strong” rating; any elements with a “Satisfactory” rating  can be easily improved.  ***Add feedback below.*** | **Consider this proposal:** Some elements were rated “Strong” but others were  rated “Satisfactory,” indicating some areas that need further development. With feedback,  the proposers could improve  the project plan. ***Add feedback below.*** | **Do not fund this proposal in  its current form:** The proposal does not align with the Racial Equity Award program’s goals,  or several of the elements  above were rated as  “Developing.” With feedback, the proposers could revise their project plan for consideration  in future grant cycles. ***Add feedback below.*** |

**Assessment:** \_\_\_Strong \_\_\_Satisfactory \_\_\_Developing (type an X on the line before your score)

**Explain:**

**SECTION 3:** List the strengths and weaknesses of this proposal, including recommendations for improvements to the project plan that applicants could incorporate for consideration in future grant cycles. Please support your comments with citations from the proposal narrative and/or CVs presented by the applicant. *Comments in this section will be shared with the applicants.*

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses/Recommended Improvements:**