



NCVP Grant Review Process and Overview

The [National Center for Veterinary Parasitology](#) (NCVP) supports training, research, and service in veterinary parasitology. As part of our mission to support parasitology research, we offer competitive research grants to members of the American Association of Veterinary Parasitologists (AAVP).

Timeline: Request for proposals (RFP) are disseminated in May, mid-July, and mid-August. Proposals are due September 1st every year and funding decisions are made mid-October. Research grants are funded for 1-year and funds are disbursed in November or December.

Proposal Submission: Proposals are submitted through the NCVP website [grant portal](#). Once a proposal has been submitted, an automatic message is sent acknowledging receipt.

Proposal Review: Once a proposal is received by NCVP, it is triaged, conflicts of interest with reviewers are identified, and then the proposal is disseminated to our scientific panel for review.

Triage: All proposals are screened to ensure they fit within the scope of NCVP grant purpose, are of scientific value, and conform to the guidelines stated in the RFP.

Conflicts-of-Interest: Our conflict-of-interest policy follows that of the federal regulation governing the Scientific Peer Review of Research Grant Applications and Research and Development Contract Projects (42 CFR Part 52h). Conflicts of interest exists when a reviewer has a competing interest that could unduly influence, or be reasonably seen to do so, their evaluation of a grant proposal.

Review Process: Proposals that make it through triage are disseminated to our scientific review panelists that do not have conflicts of interest. Review panelists typically include NCVP academic advisors, previous grant recipients, and content experts not formally affiliated with NCVP.

- Proposals are scored according to *a priori* criteria established by the NCVP scientific review panel. These include background and significance, purpose/specific aims/hypothesis(es), experimental design and methods, data analyses, expected results and outcome(s), broader impact, budget and justification, and writing and format.
- Preference points can be given at the discretion of individual reviewers. Preference points are typically given for junior faculty status, clinically relevant research, high amount of student involvement, and investigators at AVMA-accredited institutions, among others.
- Z-scores are calculated for each proposal and then ranked from highest to lowest.
- Funding decisions are made by the scientific panel that consider proposal scores as well as how well the proposed research advances the discipline.

Final Study Reports: In-life phases of each grant award last 1-year. Final study reports are due 6-months after the in-life phase of the research is completed. The final study report should include dates in which the project was active, total funding, introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion, and outcomes (e.g., publications, external grants submitted, presentations).

Expectations. Student involvement in the proposed research is mandatory. Presentation of research results at an AAVP annual meeting is expected. Publication of research results in a respected peer-reviewed journal is highly encouraged.