

Strength in Numbers: Using group peer-review for grant review

Shari Whicker, MEd, EdD¹, Mariah Rudd, BS¹, Alisa Nagler, JD, EdD², David Musick, PhD¹
Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine¹, American College of Surgeons²

Background

- Expertise of multiple reviewers is often sought for manuscript, grant, and other scholarly submissions
- Group peer review (GPR) has recently been introduced to the scholarly peer-review process, a traditionally independently-driven activity
- GPR relies on the complementary expertise of a small team, requires the active exchange of ideas, and necessitates ongoing collaboration

Methods

- A team of health professions educators recently deployed GPR for review of a national grant submission after one study team member (DM) was asked to review proposals for national grant
- Recruited a group of faculty reviewers to provide score and comments for each proposal
- Individual scores were averaged and comments from each reviewer were distributed to group
- Group convened to summarize, discuss, dissect, and share thoughts on each proposal
- Group reached a scoring consensus and provided feedback

REVIEWER NAME: _____	TITLE PROPOSAL: _____	SCORING RUBRIC	YOUR SCORE
REVIEW CRITERION: 1. Is there a statement of the problem and rationale for the study?			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Somewhat: 1 point; Yes: 2 points			
REVIEW CRITERION: 2. Is a review of pertinent literature provided?			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Somewhat: 1 point; Yes: 2 points			
REVIEW CRITERION: 3. Is there a meaningful reference to a conceptual framework that informs the research?			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Somewhat: 1-4 points; Yes: 5 points			
REVIEW CRITERION: 4. Is the research question clear, interesting and does it flow logically from the problem statement?			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Somewhat: 1-4 points; Yes: 5 points			
REVIEW CRITERION: 5. Is the overall study design explained and appropriate in light of the research question?			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Somewhat: 1-2 points; Yes: 3 points			
REVIEW CRITERION: 6. Is the collection method or instrumentation well described and adequate?			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Somewhat: 1-2 points; Yes: 3 points			
REVIEW CRITERION: 7. Is the sampling strategy adequate (both for qualitative and quantitative studies)			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Somewhat: 1-2 points; Yes: 3 points			
REVIEW CRITERION: 8. Is an analytic method described and appropriate in light of the research question and the nature of the data?			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Somewhat: 1-2 points; Yes: 3 points			
REVIEW CRITERION: 9. Is the budget appropriate, realistic?			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Somewhat: 1-4 points; Yes: 5 points			
REVIEW CRITERION: 10. Is the proposal clearly written?			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Somewhat: 1-2 points; Yes: 3 point			
REVIEW CRITERION: 11. Does this study bridge (1 point each for maximum of 5 points); GEA sections, regions, professions, institutions, or intra-institutional departments?			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Yes: 5 points			
REVIEW CRITERION: 12. Does this study target one of the priority content areas ??			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Yes: 3 points			
REVIEW CRITERION: 13. Does the PI and research team seem qualified to carry out the research?			
COMMENT: No: 0 points; Somewhat: 1-2 points; Yes: 3 points			
REVIEW CRITERION: COMMENT:			
TOTAL SCORE (0-45)			

Group Peer-Review Process for Grants



Virginia Tech Carilion
School of Medicine



Results

- Review-team feedback illustrated the value of participating in group peer-review exercise
- Contributions from group resulted in an aggregate score and robust feedback for each proposal
- Process served as a meaningful faculty development exercise

Discussion

- GPR was used to make the commonly independently-driven task of grant proposal review a more active and collaborative activity
- Leveraging the expertise of several reviewers facilitated robust discussion and well-rounded, meaningful reviews for each grant
- Brings together individuals with different levels of experience and unique but complementary areas of expertise
- Results in a more thorough, quality review with the added bonus of a important faculty development opportunity

References

- Dumenco, L., Engle, D. L., Goodell, K., Nagler, A., Ovitsh, R. K., & Whicker, S. A. (2017). Expanding group peer review: a proposal for medical education scholarship. *Academic Medicine*, 92(2), 147-149.