*Please read the attached “call for applications” document to understand what each investigator team was asked to assemble. There are instructions therein for proposal formatting and for budget preparation. A primary goal of the review exercise is to give constructive, rigorous feedback to each one of the applicants so that they can improve their proposal preparation for future competitive funding (NIH, NSF, etc.). It would be greatly appreciated if these reviews could be returned by* ***May 10, 2014.*** *Please email your reviews to* *ndsu.forward@ndsu.edu**.*

**APPLICANT:** **TOTAL SCORE:       RANK:**

**Scoring Instructions**:

Please provide a score for each criterion based on the specified maximum score for each criterion. Total scores of less than 35 will not be funded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Score** |
| **(1) Intellectual merit and methodological rigor:** Does this study address an important problem? Are the conceptual framework, design, hypotheses, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well-integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project? If a population sample will be used, are the rationale for sample selection and access to the sample population described? Does the study design address data disaggregation considerations for multiple characteristics? **Maximum 15 points** |  |
| **(2) Clarity and feasibility of objectives:**  Are specific research objectives indicated? Are they clear? Are they achievable within the constraints of the budget and time provided?**Maximum 10 points** |  |
| **(3) Investigator team and relevance to NDSU Advance FORWARD goals:** Is the investigator team appropriately trained and well suited to carry out the proposed work? Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the investigators? Is this an interdisciplinary team? Will funding this proposal advance understanding of gender and/or climate?**Maximum 5 points** |  |
| **(4) Quality of dissemination plan and potential for external funding:** Do the investigators have a plan for journal paper submissions? What is the potential for getting the proposed work published? Do the investigators have a plan for external funding? What is the potential for finding external funding of the proposed work? **Maximum 10 points**  |  |
| **(5) Soundness of the budget:** Is the budget appropriate for the scope of work described? Do the budget and budget justification Itemize, describe, and justify each budget item? Are the investigators requesting funds for one year? **Maximum 5 points** |  |
| **(6) Overall quality of the application:** Does the application follow the instructions for proposal formatting provided in the *“call for applications”* document? Is this a professionally written proposal, free of spelling and grammatical errors? **Maximum 5 points** |  |
| **TOTAL SCORE** |  |

Please provide a summary statement with comments for the investigator team. These comments can be valuable to the PIs, whether the project is funded or not. Please avoid making personal statements

about the applicants, as your comments (albeit anonymous) will be forwarded directly to them. Your comments should be constructive and evaluative.