

## ATTACHMENT 4A

# NONCOMPETITIVE REVIEW PLAN FOR APPLICATIONS

Noncompetitive applications will be evaluated in accordance with the following procedures:

### Noncompetitive Financial Assistance Determination

Prior to initiating a merit review of a noncompetitive financial assistance application, the program official must determine that the application satisfies one or more of the selection criteria set forth in 2 CFR Part 910.126(c). This determination must be approved by the individuals identified in 2 CFR Part 910.126 (d). If the application is accepted as an unsolicited proposal, the conditions set forth in 2 CFR Part 910.126 (c)(7) must be satisfied.

**Official Responsible for the Review:** The official responsible for the review must:

- Select qualified reviewer(s).
- Obtain a conflict of interest/non-disclosure certificates (see attachment 2) from each merit reviewer prior to beginning the review.
- Ensure that the reviewers have a copy of this review plan and understand the process, their role, and the criteria upon which the applications are to be evaluated.
- Provide reviewers copies of the application(s) and instructions for protecting and returning them.
- Ensure that each reviewer follows this review plan and provides a sound, well documented evaluation.
- Record the individual ratings on the Individual Rating Sheet, if applicable, and calculate the score.
- Prepare a summary statement for the application, which summarizes the evaluation and the recommendations of the individual merit reviewers.
- Maintain all merit review documentation.

**Evaluation Criteria:** The application will be evaluated in accordance with the following three criteria:

1. **Significance:** The extent to which the project, if successfully carried out, will make an important and/or original contribution to the field of endeavor.
2. **Approach:** The extent to which the concept, design, methods, analyses, and technologies are properly developed, well-integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project.
3. **Feasibility:** The likelihood that the proposed work can be accomplished within the time and budget proposed by the investigators or the technical staff, given their experience and expertise, past progress, available resources, institutional/organizational commitment, and (if appropriate) access to technologies.

**Review Process:** Each Merit Reviewer must independently review the application and complete the attached Review Form for Noncompetitive Applications. Reviewers should:

- Provide a narrative critique (i.e., written comments) for each of the three evaluation criteria. Reviewers should note any unusually high or low cost-effectiveness under the feasibility criterion. Indicate whether the application has merit based on the consideration of the three evaluation criteria or adopt a rating scale and provide the scale and overall score for the three evaluation criteria.

- If appropriate, comment on aspects of the application that fall outside the evaluation criteria review (e.g., environmental or human subject concerns).
- Provide a recommendation for funding.
- Provide contact information (phone number, email address)
- Sign and date the review form.

**Summary Statement:** The official responsible for the review will prepare a summary statement of the review process of the application. The summary statement is the official merit review record and provides the selection official an assessment of the technical/scientific merit of the application. A template for the Summary Statement is attached.

Attachments to Attachment 4:

Attachment 4A - REVIEW FORM FOR NONCOMPETITIVE APPLICATIONS

Attachment 4B - SUMMARY STATEMENT

**Attachment 4B**

**REVIEW FORM FOR NONCOMPETITIVE APPLICATIONS**

**Applicant Name:**

**Project Title:**

**Evaluation Criteria**

1. **Significance:** The extent to which the project, if successfully carried out, will make an original and/or important contribution to the field of endeavor.
2. **Approach:** The extent to which the concept, design, methods, analyses, and technologies are properly developed, well-integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project.
3. **Feasibility:** The likelihood that the proposed work can be accomplished within the time and budget proposed by the investigators or the technical staff, given their experience and expertise, past progress, available resources, institutional/organizational commitment, and (if appropriate) access to technologies. Note any unusually high or low cost-effectiveness.

**Narrative Critique:** Provide written comments for each of the evaluation criterion. Your specific comments on the application's strengths and weaknesses with respect to the evaluation criteria are critical to the evaluation process.

**Indication of Merit or Rating Scale:** Indicate if the application has merit. If a rating scale was adopted, assign a rating that reflects the overall merit of the application based on your consideration of the three evaluation criteria.

**Special Note:** If appropriate, provide comments below on aspects of the application that fall outside of the evaluation criteria review (e.g., environmental or human subjects concerns).

**Recommendation:** Check one.

- Fund project.  
 Fund in part (Describe which part)  
 Reject  
 Other (Explain)

**Reviewer:**

Name:  
E-mail Address:  
Phone:

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Attachment 4C**

**SUMMARY STATEMENT**

**Applicant Name:**

**Project Title:**

**Brief Description of Project:**

**Proposed Budget:**

**Indication of Merit or Rating**

**Narrative Critique:** (Address each criterion)

**Special Note:**

**Recommendation:** Fund Project \_\_\_\_\_ Yes; \_\_\_\_\_ No; \_\_\_\_\_ Partial (explain)  
(In the event there is a lack of unanimity in the individual rating sheets, provide rationale for the recommendation.)

**Reviewers:**

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Official Responsible for the Review)

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_