

## Peer Review of Research Grant Applications Policy

<b>Document Type:</b>	Policy and Procedures
<b>Administering Entity:</b>	Academic Board Research Committee
<b>Records Management System Number:</b>	SED05/372
<b>Date Endorsed by Board:</b>	16 May 2005
<b>Date Approved by Council:</b>	6 June 2005
<b>Indicative Time for Review:</b>	Three years from approval date
<b>Responsibility for Review:</b>	Academic Board Research Committee

### 1. Rationale and Scope

- 1.1 The University of New England is committed to excellence in research practice. The following operating procedures have been adopted as mechanisms for improving quality assurance in research.
- 1.2 This document is intended to build upon the supporting resources that assist academic staff enhance their opportunities for success.

### 2. Principles

- 2.1 To support and encourage faculty and inter-faculty level collaboration and mentoring.
- 2.2 To maximize the use of local and expert knowledge for the enhancement of grant application quality while minimizing cost to the University.
- 2.3 To assist UNE researchers in the production of grant applications while fostering a research culture where writing multiple drafts of applications is minimised.
- 2.4 To provide maximum and equitable grant writing assistance to all researchers in a context where currently one grants officer serves the entire university research community.

### 3. Definition of Peer Review

- 3.1 UNE adopts the National Academies Press' definition of "peer review" which states:

*A peer-review is a critical review performed by peers ( persons having technical expertise in the subject matter to be reviewed to a degree at least equivalent to that needed for the original work") who are independent of the work being reviewed. The peer's independence from the work being reviewed means that the peer, a) was not involved as a participant, supervisor, technical reviewer, or adviser in the work being reviewed, and b) to the extent practicable, has sufficient freedom from funding considerations to assure the work is impartially reviewed.*

Source: <http://books.nap.edu/openbook/0309059437/html/9.html>

### 4. Procedures

- 4.1 All UNE researchers planning to submit grant applications and/or expressions of interest naming UNE as the administrative institution (including UNE Grants i.e. URGs and Priming Grants) must ensure their application is peer reviewed prior to submitting it to the Research Grants Office for submission to the funding body.

- 4.2 When a researcher submits the final copy of his/her application / research proposal to the Research Grants Office, a signed and completed hard copy of the UNE Research Approval Form must be attached.
- 4.3 On the UNE Research approval form, the researcher must nominate the name of his/her peer reviewer.
- 4.4 Once the peer review has been conducted, the reviewer shall sign off on the UNE Research approval form.
- 4.5 After the research document is peer reviewed, all researchers must submit an electronic draft of their application/expression via e-mail to the Research Grants Officer for content review and administrative inspection.
- 4.6 For non-ARC grant applications and expressions of interest, researchers must submit their draft application to the Research Grants Officer according to the UNE internal deadline.

## **5. Requirements of Peer Reviewers**

- 5.1 In agreeing to be a peer reviewer, the reviewer shall provide the following within a reasonable timeframe that is not to exceed four weeks after receipt of the document for review:
  - 5.1.1 Expert advice addressing, for example, the assumptions, extrapolations, appropriateness of methodology / theory and potential for success of the proposed research and grant application shall be provided to the researcher.
  - 5.1.2 If the peer reviewer is unfamiliar with how to conduct a review, the research grants officer is available to provide assistance/guidance.
  - 5.1.3 Peer reviewers shall exhibit a high degree of professionalism and care in articulating shortcomings and making relevant and constructive recommendations.
  - 5.1.4 Peer reviewers shall maintain confidentiality and privacy of the research they have reviewed.
  - 5.1.5 In the event of misconduct, on behalf of either the researcher and/or the peer reviewer, written notification will promptly be submitted in accordance with UNE's "*Code of Conduct for Research*".
  - 5.1.6 If several attempts to identify a peer reviewer have not resulted in successful outcomes, the researcher can appeal, in written form, to the Research Committee requesting assistance and/or an exemption.

## **6. Limitations of Peer Review**

- 6.1 The peer reviewer shall not be expected to remedy any faults apparent in the research proposal nor be expected to provide future support/assistance unless the reviewer desires.
- 6.2 The principal role of a peer reviewer is to alert researchers that their work might be deficient in particular areas, rather than as proofreader/editor.

## **7. Links to Forms**

7.1 Research Approval Form <http://www.une.edu.au/research-services/rsforms.html>

7.2 Code of Conduct for Research <http://www.une.edu.au/research-services/Home/CoConRes.rtf>

## **Approval signature**

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Development)

