*Please read the attached “call for applications” document to understand what each applicant was being 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 rounds (NIH, NSF, etc.). It would be greatly appreciated if these reviews could be returned by* ***June 14, 2015****. Please email your reviews to* [*ndsu.forward@ndsu.edu*](mailto: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 likely not be funded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Score** |
| **(1) Scientific and intellectual merit:** Is the project STEM? Does this study address an important problem? Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well-integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics? Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches or methods? Are the aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies? **Maximum 15 points** |  |
| **(2) Clarity and feasibility of objectives:**  Are specific objectives indicated? Are they clear? Are they achievable within the constraints of the budget and time provided?  **Maximum 10 points** |  |
| **(3) Qualifications of the PI to carry out the proposed project:** Is the investigator appropriately trained and well suited to carry out the proposed work? **Maximum 5 points** |  |
| **(4) Potential for enhancing external funding and for increasing journal publications:** Does the PI have a plan for external funding? What is the potential for finding external funding for building on the proposed project? Does the PI have a plan for journal paper submissions? What is the potential for getting the proposed work published? **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?  **Maximum 5 points** |  |
| **(6) Overall quality of the application:** Does the application follow the instructions for application 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 PI. These comments can be very valuable feedback to the PIs, whether they are funded or not. Please avoid making personal statements about the applicant, as your comments will be forwarded directly to the applicant. Your comments should be constructive and evaluative.