

EATA GRANT REVIEW PROCEDURES

REVIEW PROCEDURES

1. All submitted proposals will initially undergo mechanical review to ensure that applications are in adherence with the grant proposal guidelines and requirements.
2. All full proposals submitted that pass initial mechanical review will receive an initial quality score from each member of the EATA research committee that does not declare a conflict of interest. If more than 6 full proposals are submitted only those in the upper 50% following initial quality scoring will undergo full review.
3. Those grants that are identified for full review will then be reviewed by no less than 3 independent reviewers including one content area expert.
 - a. reviewers will score all grants utilizing the scoring criteria listed below
 - b. the research committee chair will tabulate and review all scores and make a recommendation for funding to the committee based on the scores
 - c. the research committee will vote to approve a final funding recommendation to the EATA board of directors
 - d. the EATA board of directors will make a final decision on funding
 - e. in order for the reviews to be independent, reviewers will be asked to declare any potential conflicts of interest and will not review a proposal from the same institution/lab
4. Feedback will be provided to all applicants that undergo full review.
5. The research committee will provide formative feedback to proposals that do not undergo full review if possible based on the total volume of submissions.
6. EATA research grant scoring criteria are listed below.

EATA GRANT REVIEW CRITERIA (Full Review)

Each EATA Grant submission that meets the criteria for full review is evaluated using a standardized evaluation form that asks reviewers to judge the following:

1. Overall Grant Presentation
 - a. Neatness
 - b. Completeness
 - c. Spelling and Grammar
 - d. Format
2. Study Purpose
 - a. Within Page Limit (s)
 - b. Objective Clearly Stated
 - c. Related to Athletic Training
 - d. Clear and Concise
 - e. Goal Clearly Stated
3. Literature Review
 - a. Within Page Limit (s)
 - b. Clear and Concise
 - c. Comprehensive
 - d. Relevance Established
4. Rationale
 - a. Within Page Limit (s)
 - b. Clear and Concise
 - c. Justification for Funding Appropriate
 - d. Impact on Athletic Training Profession
5. Study Protocol and Methods
 - a. Within Page Limit (s)
 - b. Design Appropriate for Hypothesis
 - c. Statistical Design Appropriate
 - d. Clear and Concise
 - e. Appropriate Instrumentation
 - f. Adequately Powered
 - g. Preliminary Work/Data
6. Anticipated Benefit to Athletic Training
 - a. Within Page Limit (s)
 - b. Clear and Concise
 - c. Benefit to Athletic Training Research
 - d. Benefit to Athletic Training Clinical Practice
7. Budget
 - a. Appropriate for Investigation
 - b. Justification Detailed and Understandable
 - c. Impact of Grant on Study Success
8. Investigators
 - a. Pls Research Potential/Skills
 - b. Research Team Members Experience/ Skills
9. Overall Impression
 - a. Overall Impression of Proposed Study
 - b. Strengths and Weaknesses (3-5 bullet points each)

The above criteria are each judged on a likert scale (e.g., 0-5) and a total score is tallied. Reviewers are also asked to provide an overall impression (0-10) and recommendation to fund (0-3). These 3 scores are used to assess each grant submitted and determine an annual recipient.