

# VCS8002: GRANT WRITING AND PEER REVIEW

---

## Effective Term

Semester A 2025/26

## Part I Course Overview

### Course Title

Grant Writing and Peer Review

### Subject Code

VCS - Veterinary Clinical Sciences

### Course Number

8002

### Academic Unit

Veterinary Clinical Sciences (VCS)

### College/School

Jockey Club College of Veterinary Medicine and Life Sciences (VM)

### Course Duration

One Semester

### Credit Units

2

### Level

R8 - Research Degree

### Medium of Instruction

English

### Medium of Assessment

English

### Prerequisites

Nil

### Precursors

Nil

### Equivalent Courses

Nil

### Exclusive Courses

Nil

## Part II Course Details

### Abstract

Writing is a fundamental skill for biomedical researchers. This graduate course on Grant Writing and Peer Review is designed to equip students with the essential skills needed to successfully navigate the competitive landscape of research

funding. Through a combination of lectures, workshops, and practical exercises, students will learn how to develop compelling grant proposals, effectively communicate research ideas, and align their projects with funding agency priorities. The course will cover key components of grant writing, including crafting specific aims and developing a strong research plan. Additionally, students will gain insights into the peer review process, understanding how proposals are evaluated and how to respond to reviewer feedback. By engaging in peer review workshops, students will enhance their critical analysis skills and learn to provide constructive feedback. This course will help graduate students seeking to secure research funding and contribute to the advancement of their fields through well-crafted, fundable proposals.

### Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

| CILOs |  | Weighting (if app.) | DEC-A1 | DEC-A2 | DEC-A3 |
|-------|--|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1     | Draft comprehensive and persuasive grant proposals that clearly articulate research objectives, methodologies, and significance, aligning them with the priorities and requirements of potential funding agencies. | 40                  | x      | x      | x      |
| 2     | Critically assess grant proposals through a mock peer review exercise, providing constructive feedback that enhances the clarity, feasibility, and impact of the research plans.                                   | 30                  | x      | x      | x      |
| 3     | Review manuscripts and provide constructive feedback on scientific writing, clarity, and study design in the form of an anonymous peer-review.   | 30                  | x      | x      | x      |

#### A1: Attitude

Develop an attitude of discovery/innovation/creativity, as demonstrated by students possessing a strong sense of curiosity, asking questions actively, challenging assumptions or engaging in inquiry together with teachers.

#### A2: Ability

Develop the ability/skill needed to discover/innovate/create, as demonstrated by students possessing critical thinking skills to assess ideas, acquiring research skills, synthesizing knowledge across disciplines or applying academic knowledge to real-life problems.

#### A3: Accomplishments

Demonstrate accomplishment of discovery/innovation/creativity through producing /constructing creative works/new artefacts, effective solutions to real-life problems or new processes.

### Learning and Teaching Activities (LTAs)

| LTAs | Brief Description | CILO No.  | Hours/week (if applicable) |              |
|------|-------------------|---|----------------------------|--------------|
| 1    | Grant writing     | Students will draft a research grant proposal geared to a funding agency appropriate for their research interests | 1, 3                       | 2 hours/week |
| 2    | Peer review       | Students will provide constructive feedback on their peers' grant proposals and manuscripts                       | 2, 3                       | 2 hours/week |

### Assessment Tasks / Activities (ATs)

|   | ATs                  | CILO No. | Weighting (%) | Remarks ("- for nil entry) | Allow Use of GenAI? |
|---|----------------------|----------|---------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Grant writing        | 1, 2, 3  | 60            | -                          | No                  |
| 2 | Peer review feedback | 1, 2, 3  | 40            | -                          | Yes                 |

**Continuous Assessment (%)**

100

**Assessment Rubrics (AR)****Assessment Task**

Grant writing

**Criterion**

Student grants will be graded on their specific aims, significance and impact, research design, budget, and writing quality.

**Excellent**

Outstanding performance on all CILOs. Strong evidence of original thinking; good organization, capacity to analyse and synthesize; superior grasp of subject matter; evidence of extensive knowledge base.

**Good**

Substantial performance on all CILOS. Evidence of grasp of subject, some evidence of critical capacity and analytic ability; reasonable understanding of issues; evidence of familiarity with literature.

**Fair**

Satisfactory performance on the majority of CILOS possibly with a few weaknesses. Being able to profit from the course experience; understanding of the subject; ability to develop solutions to simple problems in the material.

**Marginal**

Barely satisfactory performance on a number of CILOS. Sufficient familiarity with the subject matter to enable the student to progress without repeating the course.

**Failure**

Unsatisfactory performance on a number of CILOS. Failure to meet specified assessment requirements, little evidence of familiarity with the subject matter; weakness in critical and analytic skills; limited or irrelevant use of literature.

**Assessment Task**

Peer review feedback

**Criterion**

Peer review will be evaluated on the manuscript review submission form, e.g. formulating clear and concise comments, providing constructive criticism, using appropriate language and format etc

**Excellent**

Outstanding performance on all CILOs. Strong evidence of original thinking; good organization, capacity to analyse and synthesize; superior grasp of subject matter; evidence of extensive knowledge base.

**Good**

Substantial performance on all CILOS. Evidence of grasp of subject, some evidence of critical capacity and analytic ability; reasonable understanding of issues; evidence of familiarity with literature.

**Fair**

Satisfactory performance on the majority of CILOS possibly with a few weaknesses. Being able to profit from the course experience; understanding of the subject; ability to develop solutions to simple problems in the material.

**Marginal**

Barely satisfactory performance on a number of CILOS. Sufficient familiarity with the subject matter to enable the student to progress without repeating the course.

**Failure**

Unsatisfactory performance on a number of CILOS. Failure to meet specified assessment requirements, little evidence of familiarity with the subject matter; weakness in critical and analytic skills; limited or irrelevant use of literature.

---

## **Part III Other Information**

**Keyword Syllabus**

Research presentation and communication skills, abstract writing, critical thinking, interdisciplinary collaboration

**Reading List**