Bette Hartnett
Certified Grant Professional
Nevada Department of Education (NDE)
755 N. Roop St. - #201
Carson City, Nevada  89701
775-687-7286
bhartnett@doe.nv.gov

Write for Review, Not You

This presentation provides an inside look at the peer review process for Federal discretionary grants. The people who read and score discretionary grant applications are “peer reviewers”. They are the major hurdle to a grant award; how they score an application usually decides who wins and who loses. These tips are applicable to any grant proposal in any subject area for Federal grant programs, as well as proposals for private and corporate funders.

Bette Hartnett has reviewed for several programs for the U. S. Department of Education, as well as her own State agency. She has worked in California, Wyoming, and online education K-University for 25 years as a general, teacher, and science education teacher, lecturer, and associate professor; teacher mentor; California state science exam writer; and grant professional. Bette began writing grant applications for private and corporate funding in her "spare time" to fund her own high school science program. In four years she brought in nearly $500,000 for her students, colleagues, the high school, and teachers throughout the school district; two of her applications won funder awards.

In 2006, she accepted the newly created discretionary grant professional position at the Nevada Department of Education. That same year Bette began working as a peer reviewer for U.S. Department of Education grant programs in order to refine her own skills. In doing so, she gained insight into how Federal grants are funded and what constitutes a competitive, high-quality application. In less than five years she has brought more than $110 million in Federal, private, and corporate grant funds to Nevada education, as well as collaborated on successful applications for other State agencies.
**Write for Review, Not You: Federal Discretionary Grant Peer Reviews**

**THE REVIEW**

Discretionary (competitive) grant applications submitted to Federal agencies are generally required to be read and scored by one or more independent “peer reviewers” (for this presentation peer reviewers will be referenced as "reviewers"). Reviews generally take place over a two week period; however, a third or fourth week may be added depending on the number of applications each reviewer must read and score, as well as how smoothly the review process progresses. Reviewers generally have knowledge, expertise, and/or experience in the subject of the grant or are skilled in project design, management, and evaluation (e.g., research methodology). Reviewers are selected based on their qualifications by education degree attained, experience and/or expertise in a particular discipline, program management experience, budget expertise, prior review experience, and/or recommendation by a program officer. Reviewers who register to review for a grant program are invited to participate and are expected to devote the hours required to complete a review according to scheduled deadlines.

Reviewers reside in all parts of the country and have varying degrees of personal experiences, so they may or may not be familiar with the geography, demographics, economies, politics, government structure and procedures, and/or business and industry in a particular region or state. For example, reviewers may not know that Nevada's Clark County School District (Las Vegas metropolitan area) is the fifth largest in the nation. As one reviewer asked me, "You mean Vegas actually has kids?" and another asked if I ate lunch frequently at a restaurant in Las Vegas, which would be about 450 miles from my workplace in Carson City. If not provided with geographical background information, a statement in an application about geographical barriers in Nevada may be meaningless to someone from the East Coast who can travel through three states in less time than it takes to drive from Reno to Las Vegas. Nevada's Nye and Elko Counties are geographically the third and fourth largest counties in the continental U.S.; Nye is larger than the combined area of four states; Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Delaware. Often reviewers who have never ventured West of the Mississippi River cannot comprehend the geographical vastness and isolation, and biological and geological diversity in Western states.

**THE REVIEWER'S JOB**

The job of a reviewer is to read a proposal, critically analyze the merit of a project based strictly on what is presented in the application to fulfill grant program requirements, and assign numerical scores to a series of program selection criteria. The reviewer writes comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the applicant's project based on the grant program priorities, requirements, and selection criteria. The reviewer assigns a score for each selection criterion. Occasionally the program provides guidance and a rubric; however, rubrics are still a rarity. Therefore, it is imperative that the reviewer be thoroughly knowledgeable about the grant program by reading the RFA (RFP, NIA, FRN)\(^1\).

Unless the review is conducted solely by an individual reviewer, it will generally consist of a panel of two to five reviewers who work in their own locale and/or may travel for an onsite session to the grant program origin, generally Washington, D.C. A Panel Facilitator is assigned to each panel. The Panel Facilitator's job is not to influence scores, but to provide guidance in clarifying issues and answering questions, move the panel discussions along, check reviewer’s comments, provide feedback to reviewers regarding suggested technical changes and/or corrections, and encourage panel members to try to agree on scores that are within an acceptable point range of discrepancy. An application with widely discrepant reviewer scores (e.g., 33, 51, 87 out of 100 possible points) may be required to be reviewed a second time to determine if reviewers can come to agreement on a less discrepant point range.
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The reviewer is expected to consider the Panel Facilitator's comments and suggestions for changes. If the reviewer chooses not to change per the suggestions, it is expected the reviewer will discuss reasons why not with the Panel Facilitator and they will arrive at an agreement that satisfies both of them. At the conclusion of the formal review, the reviewers submit a final technical review for each applicant. The technical review will be provided to the applicants and may be posted for viewing by the public. Reviewer names may be made public; however, the applications they reviewed will not be disclosed.

Reviewers must sign a variety of assurances and information forms to ensure review integrity and avoid problems that could discredit the grant program or reviewer, or produce negative outcomes for applicants. Assurances and forms include, but are not limited to conflict of interest to ensure there is none, confidentiality agreement, and 1099 tax form to receive payment for services. Occasionally, a grant program will solicit volunteer reviewers. After the review has concluded and all forms, documents, and signed and dated technical reviews are submitted to the program, the reviewer is required to delete all online copies of applications, scores, and comments that the reviewer may have saved, and shred all hard copies. Once the review is completed and the review has ended, the reviewer will no longer have access to the online documents; the reviewer cannot alter the completed technical review comments or scores.

**REVIEW PANELS**

Reviewers may be assigned to a panel generally comprised of two to five people who read and score the same three to 12 applications. Unless the review is onsite, the panel meets via phone for an initial conference with the Panel Facilitator to get to know each other and understand expectations. Reviewers then convene via phone at agreed dates and times to discuss the merit of the application and each of their scores. Reviewers are not allowed to discuss the applications prior to the phone conference dates to ensure that the scores are not unduly influenced. During a panel discussion, a reviewer might bring information to the attention of other reviewers that the others missed, or that the reviewer knows from personal experience, knowledge, or expertise to be questionable. For example:

- One reviewer may score an application low for "... not realistic or feasible to complete the project on time and within budget." The reviewer might point out that 92% of the budget is earmarked for personnel salaries, while only 3% is earmarked for the target population support, the latter the focus and purpose of the project. Thus, to implement the project in the scope described, the 3% funding is unlikely to realistically support the target population costs.

- A reviewer may point out that what is touted as innovation in a project is not innovative, but is business-as-usual nationwide, has been replicated in varying forms for the last 15 years, or is a common project design that is not documented by measurable state or regional success.

- A reviewer might highlight that seven partners in the project are listed in the Abstract; however, as the project is described, only three partners are mentioned throughout the Narrative as having any involvement or participation in the project.

- A project specific evaluation required by the program might be described by a reviewer as a generic methodology that has not been modified for the proposed project, lacking realistic and feasible performance measures to document project efficacy.
Just the facts, Ma'am

To write for reviewers, eliminate the fluff and stick to the facts. Reviewers have neither the time nor desire to wade through 6, 7, or 20 pages of information that is irrelevant to the grant program priorities and selection criteria. On average, a reviewer receives a $100 honorarium per application and must score three to 12 applications in a 10 day or less time period.

The 3 Cs: Clear, Concise, Coherent

CLEAR

Precisely respond to priorities and selection criteria, always explaining what could be unknown, misunderstood, or erroneously assumed by a reviewer. Use the same terms as the grant program with only one term for one meaning. For example, a "pre-service teacher candidate" should always be referenced as exactly that and nothing else. Ensure that spelling, grammar, punctuation, and syntax are without errors. Reviewers want to be able to access information quickly and easily, so organize the sections of the application using the exact headings and sub-headings of the grant program priorities and selection criteria. Following is an example of headings and sub-headings of the grant program priorities and selection criteria. For example, a project Narrative should always include applicant background information and follow an outline of headings and subheadings using the grant program criteria. Example:

BACKGROUND

Nevada Population, Geography, Economy, Target Population Demographics

PRIORITY 1: INTERVENTION for LOW-INCOME TARGET POPULATION

Selection Criterion 1: Project Need

a) Need for intervention documented by valid and reliable data
b) Quality of the intervention as a new or established program
c) Expected efficacy of the intervention

Selection Criterion 2: Project Design

a) Goal(s)
b) Measurable objective(s)
c) Measurable, performance-based outcome(s)
d) Activity(s) to achieve goals and objectives (type of work proposed)
e) Benchmark(s)

Selection Criterion 3: Adequacy of Resources

a) Matching / in-kind resources
b) Personnel
c) Sustainability beyond the grant period

Selection Criterion 4: Management Plan

a) Governance structure for the proposed project
b) Partners
c) Project staff and management protocol
d) Timeline of activities and project deliverables correlated to goals, objectives, activities

Selection Criterion 5: Evaluation Plan

a) External evaluator
b) Performance measures: Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)
c) Alternative measures (project specific objectives, outcomes, benchmarks)
d) Methodology and metrics: Quantitative and qualitative data to be collected, analyzed, and used to guide project activities and modifications
CONCISE Write sentences that pack a lot of information without the fluff. Use simple charts, tables, and graphics to organize and compact information, data, and timelines.

COHERENT Never assume the reviewer is knowledgeable about acronyms, data, or familiarity with a location, organization, or event. Include a "Glossary of Terms and Acronyms" either following the Table of Contents, at the end of the Narrative, or as an Appendix. Terminology differs from region to region throughout the country. A cougar, Mexican lion, mountain lion, deer tiger, puma, Florida panther, swamp lion, and catamount are all the same animal. The terminology for the same animal changes depending on the region of the country. Without a clear definition or explanation of terminology, a reviewer may erroneously assume or interpret what the grant writer intended. For example, Nevada is the only state in which the 17 school districts are the 17 local education agencies (LEAs). In other states, each LEA is comprised of two or more school districts. Therefore, unless it is clearly explained to the contrary, if the grant program uses the term LEA, it is imperative that a Nevada grant application neither substitute the term "school district" for LEA nor interchangeably use LEA and school district. Reviewer confusion may result in point deductions and a lower score for the applicant.

Processes and procedures, as well as interpretation of law, vary according to the area in which a reviewer resides or the reviewer's personal experiences. For example, if a Nevada grant professional states, "The Superintendent of Public Instruction will submit a Bill Draft Request (BDR) to the Legislature for consideration of new legislation", most reviewers will erroneously interpret that to mean the Superintendent is engaged in lobbying and/or that it is illegally influencing legislators based on Federal regulations. In Nevada, the BDR is one process in how government business is conducted and is not lobbying or illegally influential. This must be explained for reviewers.

Cover All Bases

FOLLOW DIRECTIONS - FOLLOW DIRECTIONS - FOLLOW DIRECTIONS

One of the common, major downfalls of grant applications is failure by the writer(s) to FOLLOW DIRECTIONS specified in the RFA. If the Narrative is limited to 30 pages, double-spaced, 12 point Times New Roman font, 1" margins all sides of paper, then do not exceed 30 pages and FOLLOW THE DIRECTIONS. If measurable outcomes and benchmarks are required and you are uncertain how to write them or compare them to baseline data, ASK FOR HELP. Reviewers often stare at an application section, shake their heads, and wonder what the heck the writer was thinking - or not thinking. ALWAYS focus the project proposal on Who, What, Why, Where, When, How, How Many, How Much, SO WHAT?

WHO
applicant background  •  target population  •  partners  •  key project personnel  •  subgrantees

WHAT
purpose  •  project design  •  steps / actions / activities / tasks to be accomplished  •  measurable objectives  •  measurable outcomes  •  milestones / benchmarks  •  evaluation plan
WHY
project need • cost-effectiveness • improvements •
short-term benefits • long-term benefits • use of technology • peer reviewed / other
references to support why the project is needed, has potential, will produce expected outcomes

WHERE
project activities location(s) • key personnel operating location(s) •
dissemination / communication / training / conferences / oversight locations

WHEN
timeline for employment of key personnel • timeline of activities / milestones / benchmarks
• initiation and completion of activities / tasks / data collection / oversight / review /
modifications • reporting schedule • dissemination of information plan

HOW
governance structure • management plan • partner buy-in • systems • sustainability

HOW MANY
target population and other beneficiaries • number of active partners • scale-up

HOW MUCH
budget • budget justification (budget narrative) • time • cost matching / in-kind

SO WHAT?
summarize • recap • restate • why the project is great • funder benefit

One may now ask, SO WHAT is so difficult in writing a high-quality, competitive application? Do the little things really matter? Oh yes, they definitely do. A point lost here and there can mean the difference between funding and no funding. The "cut score" or point level at which funding occurs can be less than one point. When writing a discretionary grant application to maximize the competitive edge, the writer must WRITE FOR REVIEWERS, not the writer's employer, the applicant, or the grantor. Write for the reviewers and always assume the reviewers know nothing about the people, places, or events in the project which is proposed. This takes a bit more thought, some extra time, and looking through the lens of others; however, it will pay off when reviewers do not waste time and become frustrated or angry wading through pages of unnecessary information, dozens of appendices, and generic, vague text. Make every effort to ensure reviewers do not misinterpret, erroneously assume, or fail to comprehend what is written.

Work as a Reviewer
Reviewing grant applications provides tremendous insight into what makes or breaks a quality application. The best training for writing a high-quality, competitive grant application is to review applications for grant or subgrant programs. On pages 7-9 are resources to get started.
Where to Find Grant Programs Soliciting Peer Reviewers

Serving as a grant application review panelist is an excellent way to learn about the grant process, become familiar with a particular grant program and/or funding agency, learn about innovations in your area of interest, and network with colleagues and funding agency representatives in your field. Review panel service is one of the single best ways to prepare to write a high-quality, competitive grant proposal. Generally, reviewers receive a stipend and if applicable, travel expenses. However, some programs request volunteers.

Some Federal agencies rely heavily on higher education faculty and scholars to review and advise them on which proposals should be funded. For example, to review for the National Science Foundation one must have a doctoral degree. Other agencies look for experience and expertise in one or more disciplines, rather than the level of education or degree attained. Agencies are always seeking to enrich their rosters of potential review panelists and many Federal agencies now provide information online about how to become a review panelist.

Private and corporate funders do not often solicit external reviewers. Instead, they may utilize employees, consultants, experts they invite to review, and/or a governing board.

_________________________

U. S. Department of Education (ED) - Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE)  http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/index.html

_________________________


_________________________

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Includes the steps to take to sign up for the USDA peer review program. http://www.csrees.usda.gov/business/prs.html

_________________________


_________________________

Human Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) Located under the “Apply Now” section, includes a link to register to become a grant reviewer. https://grants.hrsa.gov/webReview

_________________________

Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Lists the qualifications to become a SAMHSA grant reviewer. Includes a link to download their online application.  http://www.samhsa.gov/Grants/emailform/index.asp
Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS)
This webpage includes a link to learn about this organization’s programs, a link to review their handbook, and a link to submit your application. http://www.imls.gov/reviewers/reviewers.shtm

National Science Foundation (NSF)
Why You Should Volunteer to Serve As A NSF Reviewer

http://www2.ed.gov/fund/grant/find/edlite-forecast.html
FORECAST OF FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAMS FOR FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2011
This website provides a list of funding opportunities and their submission and review deadlines. You can estimate that a review may two to six weeks after a submit deadline. Visit the program website and if there is no information about a peer review (i.e., Call for Peer Reviewers), e-mail the program officer and ask if there will be one and how you can receive information to apply as a peer reviewer. EXAMPLE:

<p>| CFDA = Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance | OESE = Office of Elementary and Secondary Education |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFDA No. and Name</th>
<th>Application Notice</th>
<th>Application Deadline</th>
<th>Deadline for Intergovernmental Review</th>
<th>Estimated Average Size/Number of Awards</th>
<th>Program Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Other Resources

- **How to Become a Grant Reviewer**  
  By Karen M. Markin, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*  

- **A Guidebook for Federal Grant Reviewers**  
  By Karen A. Morison, *The Heritage Foundation*  
  [http://www.heritage.org/research/governmentreform/fedbook.cfm](http://www.heritage.org/research/governmentreform/fedbook.cfm)

- **NSF Grant Reviewer Tells All**  
  By Pamela L. Member, *Science Careers*  
  [http://sciencecareers.scientificamerican.com/career_development/previous_issues/articles/2310/nsf_grant_reviewer_tells_all/](http://sciencecareers.scientificamerican.com/career_development/previous_issues/articles/2310/nsf_grant_reviewer_tells_all/)

- **eHOW.com**  
  *How to Get Paid to Review Government Grant Proposals | eHow.com*  

- Contact local agencies, institutions, organizations, and funders to find out if they use peer reviewers to review their grant and/or subgrant applications. Paid or not, it is valuable experience and provides insight into what funders want in grant and subgrant applications.

NOTES