

SELECTION CRITERIA OF GRANT FUNDERS

BY

PROF. ELVIS SHU



SELECTION CRITERIA

- Every funder has a philosophy or philosophies driving their commitment towards an issue to which they commit their resources
- Reviewers on the other hand have important elements of a grant proposal which guide them
- There are reviewers' expectations:



Funding Agency

- Funder's philosophy and guidelines
- Does the proposal align with Funding Agency's area of interest (mission, scope, funding Call, training needs)
- Appropriate type size, font, spacing and margination, word count, max number of pages
- If attachments not required, do not submit



Alignment of Proposal with Strategic Plan of Institution/Gov

- Should be included in the Narrative of the proposal or tied to the Outcomes of the project
- Where does it fit within your institution's or gov strategy and vision
- Involvement of policy makers in writing the proposal and in the execution of the project, to ensure use by gov



Relationship with Funding Agency

- Organization had similar project in the past with similar budget, focus area
- Does the previous experience set them up for success with the new project?
- Previous compliance incidents with funder may hamper success
- Except solicitation was designed for first time applicants



Previous Research Work

- To establish need for the project
- What is the problem and why is it happening
- What activities to support the effort to address the problem
- Is there sufficient preliminary data (published and/or unpublished) to support the proposal
- Is there third party data. Issue of Lit Rev.



Institutional Resources Required

- Resources (space, personnel and other facilities) required by the institution and researcher
- Is institution willing to commit and make them available?
- Is this commitment stated in the letter of support by the institution?



PI Eligibility

- Required qualification
- Successful with similar projects that will convey capacity to the reviewers
- Has time for oversight of the project



Collaborators

- Could be an NGO, Institution, gov entity, other grant maker
- What specific roles to be played
- Are they experienced in the type of project
- If no collaborator, can the individual organisation fully implement the project
- Letters of support by collaborator



Project Title

- Does the proposal have a winning grant title
- Title should be comprehensive enough to indicate the nature of the proposed work, and brief
- Should align with the Aim of the study



Project Description

- Detailed description of how the project will be executed
- how exactly the pieces fit together to achieve the desired outcome, and the different phases involved in implementing the project
- Compelling details that will capture the reviewers' attention



Measurement Plan

- Appropriate plan to monitor and measure the project outcomes
- An independent evaluator involved in the measurement ,
- or it is being implemented internally



Dissemination Plan

- Any outlined communication plan as part of the overall program to promote awareness and gain buy-in from target population
 - Does the proposal outline how the organization will publicize the research findings
 - Sharing at conferences, in publications, Blog Post for your website, or connections you have at conferences
- 

Sustainability Plan

- Has the organization specified a plan to obtain continued funding and/or
- an ability to self-sustain the project after the grant period has ended



Project Timeline

- Is there a general timeline of when the various parts of the project will be executed
- the timeline will serve to help the grantmaker to monitor the progress of the grant and ensure it is on track to hit various milestones



Detailed Budget

- Detailed line-item budget with reasonable costs (neither inflated nor underestimated) for personnel and project-related expenses
- A comprehensive Budget Justification



Common Shortfalls Cited by Reviewers

- Problem is not important enough
- Study not likely to produce useful information
- Research questions are unclear or unanswerable
- Methods unsuited to the objectives
- Problem more complex than realised by the investigator
- Research design is statistically flawed
- Insufficient consideration of statistical needs
 - sample size, proposed analysis
- Over-ambitious research plan
- Ill-defined direction or sense of priority



- Lack of original or new ideas
- Investigator inexperienced in the methodology
- Lack of focus in the hypothesis, aims or research plan
- Rationale not clearly spelt out
- Disregard to safety and ethical issues
 - IRB/IEC approval, informed consent, confidentiality etc
- Poor design eg lack of controls or comparators
- Heavily relying on initial results



THANK YOU

