

IPR Planner for Resubmissions

The Planner provided here incorporates best practices for effective internal peer review (IPR) that we have seen in the faculty and will help you establish a timeline for IPR. The suggested timelines are based on 11 weeks between the notice of recommendation and the next application deadline—more time is always better (but not always possible). We have found that setting milestones makes grant writing and the IPR process more manageable should you need to resubmit. We recommend pre-emptively scheduling your meetings as you can always cancel these if you are funded. Note that these are suggestions based on practices we have seen work. Be sure to check with your Research Institute to see if they have a different form of IPR they would like you to follow.

Milestone	Suggested time before internal deadline	Target Date	Confirmed Date	Details and considerations (for <i>Resubmissions</i>)
Review competition guidelines and identify the types of reviewer expertise required for your internal peer review	6 months			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What types of reviewers will review your application*? • Who has reviewed for the agency/competition/committee in the past**? • Who has been funded by this competition in the past**? • What methods and approaches do you plan to propose? • What pillar of research are you working within? • Do you invite the same reviewers that reviewed your original submission or new ones? <p>* Remember, for most competitions your reviewers are unlikely to be experts in your exact area of research. At least one reviewer is likely to be more of a generalist than a specialist.</p> <p>** Guidelines and criteria change often. Ensure that your internal reviewers are aware of the most up-to-date requirements.</p>
Contact your IPR Review Lead and confirm reviewers	5.5–6 months			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is the Review Lead for your Research Institute? • Your Review Lead can help you select reviewers and identify a committee chair.
Invite reviewers & chair and schedule meetings	5–6 months			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let reviewers know why you are asking them (e.g., what expertise/experience do you hope to draw on). • Tell reviewers what competition you are applying to and a bit about your research. • Be clear about what you are asking of them (e.g., how many meetings, the purpose of each meeting, how long will they have to provide their feedback). • Invite your internal reviewers to provide the same honest, constructive feedback they would give if they were committee members reviewing for the competition. Asking them to provide an actual score provides the most important information. • Confirm your commitment to meet deadlines and carefully consider their feedback.

<p>Meeting #1 - How to approach the reviewer feedback</p>	<p>10 weeks</p>			<p>Send your internal reviewers the following as soon as you receive your notice of recommendation (NOR)/results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competition guidelines/objectives, evaluation criteria, committee mandates (if you are considering changing committees) • Your complete, previously submitted application • The reviewer feedback you received <p>Ask your internal reviewers the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the reviewers telling me? • Should I resubmit immediately, or do I need to wait? Should I resubmit at all? • What are the main issues, and can they be addressed? • Does my plan to address the comments make sense? • Did you identify other issues with my grant?
<p>Meeting #2 – Draft resubmission</p>	<p>6–7 weeks</p>			<p>Send your internal reviewers the following at least 1 week prior to the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competition guidelines/objectives, evaluation criteria, instructions for each section of the grant • Your full draft application—it is important to also obtain feedback on sections like your summary of progress, response to reviewers, HQP training plan, EDI plan, etc. <p>At the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let the peer review criteria for your competition guide the meeting. • Start by asking your reviewers about the strengths and weaknesses. • Ask if you have adequately addressed the previous reviewer feedback. • Ask for feedback on both the scientific content and the grantsmanship.
<p>3rd review (written feedback and/or external review)</p>	<p>3–4 weeks</p>			<p>Send your reviewers the following at least 1 week prior:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your revised application • Summary of feedback from your last meeting • Competition guidelines, instructions, and evaluation criteria
<p>Send to CSM Grant Development for review</p>	<p>1–2 weeks</p>			<p>Send the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your full application, including the budget (not just the proposal) • Any specific questions or areas to focus on
<p>Submit to RSO – Final Internal Deadline</p>	<p>0 weeks</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your Department Head and the Associate Dean, Research Grants must approve your RMS record <u>before</u> the internal deadline. • You must submit your final complete application to RSO by the internal deadline, which is typically noon, 3 business days before the agency deadline but there are exceptions; watch for weekends/long weekends ahead of the agency deadline.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• See External Grant Application Requirements and RSO's Research Opportunities Database for more details on how to submit your application and internal deadlines.
--	--	--	--	--