

Summary of Innovation for Health (IFH) Proposal Evaluation Process

Prior to the distribution of the proposals to the reviewers, the IFH steering committee will evaluate the following.
Proposals that do not meet these minimum requirements will be returned without review.

- ☐ Yes or ☐ No **Were the proposal guidelines followed?** (If no, the proposal will not be reviewed.)
- ☐ Yes or ☐ No Do the aims and budget represent a **meaningful collaboration** between the investigators and is **meaningful institutional support** provided? (If no, the proposal will not be reviewed.)
- ☐ Yes or ☐ No **If applicable**, was a plan for securing IRB (human subjects) or IACUC (animal study) approvals provided? (If no, the proposal will not be reviewed.)

If a proposal is accepted as submitted, it will be distributed to the reviewers. The review process will take two to three months.

The criteria used by reviewers to evaluate IFH proposals are:

- **Approach:** Are the conceptual or clinical framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well-integrated, well-reasoned, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?
- **Impact:** Reflects the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved. Is the proposal competitive for additional external funding to advance health care? Does the project provide meaningful experiential learning opportunities that prepare new generations of experts in the field? Does the proposal hold the potential to meaningfully improve the Greater Peoria and Central Illinois community? Note that an application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have a major community impact and thus deserve a high impact score. For example, an investigator may propose to carry out important work that by its nature is not innovative but essential to move a field forward.
- **Relevance:** Is the project a collaborative effort between Bradley University employees and OSF HealthCare Mission partners? Does the project address healthcare challenges through innovative solutions? Is it intended to demonstrate improved clinical outcomes, cost reduction, and higher quality practices through the creation of knowledge, equipment, facilities, or software to evaluate and improve health care? Does the team have the necessary experience and qualifications to conduct the project?

Reviewers will provide scores for each criterion using the following scale.

	Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
High	1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with no weaknesses
	2	Outstanding	Outstanding
	3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
Medium	4	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
	5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
	6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
Low	7	Fair	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
	8	Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
	9	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses
Non-numeric score options: DF = Deferred, AB = Abstention, CF = Conflict, NP = Not Present, ND = Not Discussed.			
Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen approach/relevance/impact.			
Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens approach/relevance/impact.			
Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits approach/relevance/impact.			

Reviewers are asked to provide comments to help applicants develop stronger grant writing skills and understand why specific scores were awarded.