**School of Arts, Languages and Cultures**

**GUIDANCE AND TEMPLATE FOR INTERNAL PEER REVIEWERS OF RESEARCH GRANT APPLICATIONS**

1. Please try to provide your comments in a timely fashion and keep to the suggested deadline; we need to give applicants enough time to make any improvements you suggest.
2. You are providing formative feedback, not a summative evaluation. Be honest, but constructive. If an application seems to have a serious flaw, it is helpful if you state this clearly; the whole idea of internal peer review is to alert applicants to weaknesses prior to submission. Be prepared to signal that the application is, in your view, premature, and needs a lot more work.
3. There is always room for improvement in even the very strongest applications, so it is not helpful simply to comment that an application is so good that you have nothing to add (just as it is not often the case that an application is so bad that there is nothing to be salvaged from it)
4. Just because the proposal is not in your immediate research area, does not mean that you cannot provide useful feedback (it is often an ‘outside’ perspective which is most insightful). Proposals will always be read by one or more specialist and non-specialist reviewer, so individual reviewers will not necessarily need to cover all aspects of a proposal in the same depth.
5. Please be sure to use the template below for your review. However, depending on the particular scheme, some sections may not need to be filled in. There is no minimum or maximum number of words per heading. Please expand the boxes as necessary.
6. Further guidance on what to cover under each heading are as follows:
	1. Contextualisation and innovation (how ‘original’ the proposed research seems to be, and how well it has been placed in the context of existing research)
	2. Quality of the proposal (this is the most important issue and will probably require the most attention; you should comment in particular on the clarity, coherence and significance of the objectives and research questions, the scale of ambition reflected in the work proposed, and the extent to which the proposed methods will enable the questions to be answered and the objectives met)
	3. Outputs and dissemination (how appropriate are the proposed publication outlets and dissemination activities; are the outputs consistent with the scale of the project and the time permitted for it?)
	4. Description of potential impact (to both academic and non-academic users; have all the potential pathways to non-academic impact been exploited? How concrete and convincing are the impact plans?; have the appropriate academic audiences been identified?)
	5. Roles (say whether the roles and responsibilities of the people concerned are clear and appropriate, and whether there are any gaps in requisite expertise in the proposed research team). If studentships are included, please comment on the viability of the proposed area of study, and its relationship to the core of the project.
	6. Management (say if the project look as though it will be efficiently managed; focus in particular on how the work of any RAs will be overseen, and how their career pathways will be enhanced by the project work)
	7. Timetable (comment on whether the timetable seems realistic)
	8. Presentational issues (layout; style; typographical errors etc)
	9. Budgetary issues (you may spot inconsistencies and errors that others have overlooked)
	10. Overall significance and value for money (this is ultimately what will decide whether the proposal is funded or not; you should ask yourself not ‘how expensive is this project?’, or ‘how can the budget be increased or cut?’, but ‘are the outputs of a scale and ambition commensurate with the money being requested?’, and ‘how important is the research likely to be to its target audiences?’)
7. Please make sure that you send your completed peer review to the divisional research coordinator who requested it.

*SALC RESEARCH GRANT PEER REVIEW TEMPLATE*

**Name and Division of Applicant**:

**Title of Proposal**:

**Funding Scheme**:

**Name and Division of Peer Reviewer**:

|  |
| --- |
| CONTEXTUALISATION AND INNOVATION |
| QUALITY OF THE PROPOSAL |
| OUTPUTS AND DISSEMINATION |
| DESCRIPTION OF POTENTIAL IMPACT (ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC) |
| ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES |
| MANAGEMENT |
| TIMETABLE |
| BUDGET AND JUSTIFICATION OF RESOURCES |
| PRESENTATIONAL ISSUES |
| OVERALL SIGNIFICANCE AND VALUE FOR MONEY |
| ANY OTHER COMMENTS |