

GRANT REVIEW POLICIES

- Questions to Consider -

Successful writers write for their audience; they take into consideration what the audience wants and needs to read in order to make a decision. Essentially, successful writers answer all the readers' questions and concerns.

Imagine that you are giving the money away. Would you give this person the amount of money requested? Any places where you are confused? Don't understand? Can find information? Those (and other glitches) are the places that need revision.

Remember--think like a funder! Would you want to spend your money here?

What the funder worries about:

- Will this project make us look good?
- Do we want to be associated with this?
- Are they competent to do the work?
- Are they credible in their claims for the work proposed?
- Do they have staying power – can/will they finish the project?
- Are they organized?
- Are they committed?
- Can I find all the information quickly?

Questions the funder is trying to get answered :

- What is the rationale for applying? Is it compelling?
- Is there an adequate sense of the problem? Is there an actual problem? Does the information they talk about show that there's a problem?
- Are needs for the project clearly identified? Is there adequate justification for items in the budget? Are these needs well-explained and are they integral to the grant?
- What are the benefits for the funder (a final product clearly stated)? Are there other compelling benefits that are not listed? Does the order or structure of the benefits list the most important one first?
- Is this investigator credible? How has that been demonstrated? Is the research accurate, relevant, and coherent?
- What is the timeline for doing the project? Are the necessary personnel requested? Is this an accurate representation of the work that needs to be done?
- Will this investigator spend our money wisely? Will we be embarrassed by our association with this group?
- Where is our money going?