



Responsibilities and Functions of School Scientific Review Committees

The School Scientific Review Committee (SRC) is responsible for evaluating the *scientific merit* of research conducted by core NSU faculty. This includes review of research proposals/projects involving:

1. Internal (e.g., CTRG) and/or external research grant applications (*in the case of the latter, only when required by the external agency as part of its application procedure*),
2. biomedical and/or behavioural (e.g., psychological, anthropological, sociological, or political) research involving human subjects,
3. research involving animal care and use, and,
4. research for which appropriate level of laboratory biosafety is required (e.g., in relation to the degree of pathogenicity of microbial infectious agents).

[Note: Faculty whose research or scholarship is based solely or primarily on engagement, review, and interpretation of classical or contemporary texts and/or the periodical literature are not normally required to submit proposals for scientific merit review (except in the case in which internal NSU CTRGC and/or external grant applications are involved).]

Faculty research proposals/projects being reviewed for scientific merit by School Scientific Review Committees should satisfy standard expectations for *research methodology in the respective discipline*, including:

- **clarity and rationality of the research question, thesis, hypotheses**
- **appropriateness of the research design**
- **strength and feasibility of the proposed research methods**
- **qualifications and experience of the researcher(s) [e.g., as principal investigator/co-investigator] and/or research team (when involving research associates, research assistants, etc.)**
- **manifest familiarity of the researcher with current scholarship on the research question, including relevant background materials**
- **for statistical studies, adequacy of sampling procedure and valid plan for statistical analysis and data control**

The SRC review of applications should be conducted in one session, with a follow-up session to be held for proposals approved tentatively with requested revision. The SRC should provide opportunity during review for the faculty principal investigator and co-investigators to be present and answer questions to clarify the research proposal/protocol to the satisfaction of members of the SRC. External reviewers (nominated by the School Deans to provide expert scientific merit review and approved by the Chair of the CTRGC) are to be included in the SRC meeting for his/her commentary and recommendation on the respectively assigned grant application(s).

The committee shall evaluate the proposal and issue a warranted judgment to (1) approve, (2) tentatively approve subject to revisions (provide due date to the principal investigator for resubmittal), or (3) disapprove/reject. Each proposal shall be referenced according to the review code (e.g., CTRGC-21-SBE-1) provided by OR-NSU and a scientific merit score (a percentage out of 100%) shall be assigned to each grant application.

When the review of grant applications is completed, the Chairperson of the SRC shall submit the SRC Report for each application reviewed to the School Dean for signature review/approval. The Dean shall then submit the SRC Review document to the Director, Office of Research (in both hard copy and electronic PDF) that includes approval signatures.

[Note: No core faculty research proposal having human subjects research protocol or animal care and use protocol should be submitted to the Office of Research for NSU Institutional Review Board/Ethics Review Committee (IRB/ERC) review or NSU Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) review unless the School SRC has reviewed the proposal for scientific merit and issued its approval.]