

Grant Camp II
September 2002
Portsmouth, VA

The scientific review process, used by the TriService Nursing Research Program (TSNRP) in screening research proposals, was the theme of the 2-day Grant Camp II, September 21-22, 2002. Sponsored by the Resource Center for Excellence in Military Nursing (RCEMN), the mock review process conducted in this Camp was intended to increase understanding of the scientific review process. This process was a logical next step from Grant Camp I in which panelists were introduced to the details of writing a research proposal. The 12 panelists who gathered in Norfolk, VA were 2 Air Force officers, 5 officers from the Army, and 5 Navy officers. With them were 6 faculty members from both the academic community and the military, all distinguished with either a PhD or an EdD.

The Grant Camp II proposal review process required panel members to comment on each other's proposal as previously assigned primary, secondary, and military reviewers. The process involved scoring the reviewed proposal on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being outstanding and 5 being fair, based on proposal contents as submitted. Presentation of prepared comments started by making note of the scores recommended by the primary and secondary reviewers. The primary reviewer described the proposed research and presented its strengths and weaknesses in accordance with the recommended score. The secondary reviewer elaborated on areas of agreement or disagreement with the primary reviewer, and like the primary reviewer, evaluated the merit of the proposal using the following criteria:

- S *Scientific approach and technical merit*
- S *Originality and innovative nature of the proposal; applicability of previous findings*
- S *Qualifications, expertise, and research experience of the principal investigator and staff*

- S *Availability of institutional resources and adequacy of the environment to support the project*
- S *Significance and relevance to nursing*
- S *Reasonableness of the budget and duration of the project*

While the military reviewer presented the military relevance and feasibility of the proposed research from the military perspective, the faculty reviewer provided research and content expertise, and made comments related to research methodology for collecting high quality data. Scores were adjusted based on information from the review comments.

To further increase proposal readiness for grant submission, panelists met with their faculty reviewers one-on-one to discuss grant packaging. They also took advantage of the optional *Grant Writing at Keyboard* session for computer tips and tricks useful in preparing proposals for submission. Shared learning from the review process was captured in a round table discussion.

Panelists' feedback about the entire review process and their participation in it was highly positive. They expressed increased understanding of the scientific review process, and complete satisfaction about the effectiveness of faculty members. As a result of their participation in the review, the majority of panelists indicated they feel prepared to submit their grant proposals.