NATA Foundation
Student Grant Program Review Process

The Student Grant Program is active from January to May:

January-February:
1. Call for proposals January 1-February 15

2. Proposals submitted by deadline (generally February 15th)

Mid-February:
1. NATA Foundation staff creates and disseminates to all committee members a summary table of submitted proposals including primary institution and names of PI(s), individuals with major professional roles, and individuals providing a letter of support

2. Committee members identify and declare conflicts of interest (COIs) using the annual COI disclosure form

3. NATA Foundation staff creates a summary table of major and minor COIs and disseminates this to Chair and Vice Chair for Student Grants

4. Chair calculates committee member reviewing workload per grant category after accounting for member COIs and shares with Vice Chair for Student Grants

5. Chair reports disclosed COIs and mitigation actions to all committee members

February-March:
1. Vice Chair for Student Grants creates review teams for each proposal. Review teams are composed of:
   a. A committee member who serves as the lead reviewer
   b. Two additional committee members who serve as secondary reviewers

2. Review team members charged with:
   a. Independently reviewing and scoring the proposal
   b. Submitting review comments and scores into the Application Manager by the specified deadline (generally late-March/early-April)

April:
1. Vice-Chair for Student Grants
   a. Reviews scores for all proposals
   b. Identifies proposals to be discussed at the committee's annual proposal review meeting (generally those in the top 50% of each grant category)
   c. Disseminates to committee members a preliminary list of proposals to be discussed at the proposal review meeting

2. Lead or secondary reviewers notify the Chair and Vice-Chair of Student Grants if they wish to discuss any proposal that was not initially identified for discussion (*e.g.,* a reviewer believes that

an unfairly harsh review(s) has contributed to a strong proposal being ranked in the bottom 50% of the grant category)

3. Vice-Chair for Student Grants disseminates to committee members the final list of student proposals to be discussed at the proposal review meeting

4. Lead reviewers assign a *Do Not Recommend for Funding* decision to proposals that will not be discussed

April/May (Proposal Review Meeting):

1. Meeting Preparation
   a. Committee members are charged with reviewing all application documents for proposals to be discussed prior to the meeting
   b. The proposal and the independent reviews submitted to the Application Manager should be reviewed

2. Proposal Discussion
   a. Lead reviewer provides the three overall impact scores submitted by the review team members
   b. Lead reviewer gives a <5min summary of the proposal, emphasizing strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, and any major review findings and discrepancies
   c. Prior to the meeting, the time limit for discussion will be set to assure that each proposal is allotted equal time for input from the secondary reviewers and open comments and/or questions from the committee. Discussion should be:
      i. limited to only the proposal on the table
      ii. focused on:
         1. the research design and ability of the team to complete the investigation,
         2. the potential impact of the proposed investigation, and/or
         3. the alignment between the proposal and the Foundation priorities or relevant RFP

3. Proposal Scoring
   a. Immediately following the discussion period, each eligible committee member confidentially casts an overall impact score (1-9) for the proposal. Scoring should be informed by the committee member's review of the proposal; the three independent reviews; and the content of the committee's discussion. Scores that do not fall within the range are allowed but require committee member(s) to explain their scores.
   b. Committee member scores are averaged to arrive at the final overall impact score for the proposal

4. Proposal Recommendation
   a. Vice-Chair for Student Grants presides over a final discussion of each grant category. The purpose of the discussion is to approve one of the following committee actions for each proposal:
      i. Recommend to the NATA Foundation Board for Funding
      ii. Do Not Recommend for Funding

Approved May 2021

      b.   After all proposals within a grant category have been discussed and scored, committee members will be provided with the final overall impact score for each proposal

      c.   The final disposition for each proposal is determined by a vote of committee members with a simple majority necessary for the motion to pass

May:

1. No more than two weeks following the proposal review meeting, lead reviewers complete the following:
    a. For proposals that were not discussed
        i. Download the three reviews submitted by the review team members from the Application Manager
        ii. Review for inappropriate or inaccurate comments and remove them, if necessary
        iii. Merge the three independent review forms into a single PDF file
        iv. Submit the final PDF file to the Foundation staff
    b. For proposals that were discussed
        i. Download the three reviews submitted by the review team members from the Application Manager
        ii. Review for inappropriate or inaccurate comments and remove them, if necessary
        iii. Complete the committee summary statement. This should include:
            1. the final overall mean impact score from the committee
            2. the final action as determined by the committee vote
            3. A summary paragraph that supports the committee's overall impact score by highlighting the points raised in the committee's discussion
        iv. Merge the committee summary sheet and the three independent review forms into a single PDF file
        v. Submit the final PDF file to the Foundation staff

2. Submitted PDF files are reviewed for accuracy (final decision, score, etc.) and approved by the Chair or Vice-Chair for Student Grants

May-June:

1. Chair sends list of proposals recommended for funding to the Board for approval

2. Notification letters and final PDF review files are sent to primary investigators

Approved May 2021