Frequently Asked Questions – Royalty Research Fund

Eligibility

Why is RRF no longer accepting applications from full Professors?
Since its inception, RRF has prioritized junior researchers for funding. Given the increasing demand for RRF support, the Office of Research made the difficult decision to narrow the program eligibility to faculty who are still building their academic careers.

I would like to recognize two mentors as Co-Investigators (Co-Is), but they will play no role in the project. Is this acceptable?
No. RRF considers Co-Is as equal in status to the PI and they must have a measurable role in the project. Also, clear justification is required to include more than one Co-I.

Application Process

When should I submit my application to ensure a full review and the chance to make any necessary corrections?
Applications received 3 to 4 business days in advance of the deadline can be assured of staff review and time to make corrections before the deadline.

Does the GIM 19 three-day rule apply to RRF?
No, it does not. The deadlines are the first Monday in March and the last Monday of September at 5 pm.

If I submit on the deadline itself and RRF staff find problems with my application, will I have a grace period to make corrections?
No. Due to the increasing numbers of applications requiring more of the review committees' time, only complete and correct applications will move on to the review phase.

In SAGE, the Approval Flow graphic has a box for OSP, but our OSP administrator says they are not involved with RRF applications. Who serves as OSP for RRF applications?
RRF staff serve as OSP for this internally funded program. They review applications for eligibility and adherence to the instructions. Then recommendations are made by faculty on peer review committees.

What are the most common errors in RRF proposals?
The most common errors are proposal sections that do not match the required page length and order of presentation. Peer reviewers have numerous proposals to read, so they need to be able to find the key information in the expected order to be able to make their assessment.

Review Process

If RRF funding is internal to UW, how are awardees selected?
Faculty across all three campuses are involved in a peer review process divided into four committees: Arts and Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Biological and Biomedical Sciences, and Physical Sciences and Engineering. Applicants select the committee that best fits the scope of their project. In meetings, committee members recommend the most competitive proposals for funding.

How much detail should I include in the "Need for RRF Support" section?
Include specific information about efforts you have made to get funding for this project such as other funding applications. Describe how the project will continue outside of the grant period. Describe how RRF support would help the PI prepare for an external funding opportunity with pilot data collection or as a proof-of-concept study.

Why is the Suggested Reviewers Memo no longer required?
The review process has changed; committee members no longer need the Suggested Reviewers Memo for the recruitment of other campus reviewers. Instead, they will use their time to directly review all of the proposals for their specific committee.

Will I still get review comments to guide a potential resubmission?
Yes, committee meeting transcripts will be used to provide constructive criticism to applicants.

Budget

Are subawards allowed on RRF grants?
No, but we do allow subcontracts, which are set up through procurement rather than OSP. Subcontractors need to be set up as vendors/suppliers in the UW system, a process that can start anytime.