Research Proposal Rating Sheets
Physics of Astronomy Week 9 - Winter 2006

Instructions to Reviewers:
• Rate each proposal after you have heard the complete presentation.
• Score each criterion on a scale of 1-5, with 5 for the top score.
• Include LEGIBLE comments explaining your ranking of each criterion.
• Write your name legibly on BACK of each rating sheet. Copies of the front will be provided to Proposers (Reviewers will be kept confidential).
• Review your rankings for mutual consistency, as far as possible.
• Try not to be swayed by personal feelings for proposers or outside influences.
• Turn in your rankings to the TA after ALL presentations are complete.

Proposer(s): ____________________________________________________________

Proposal: ____________________________________________________________

SCORE:

____ What is the intellectual merit of the proposed research?

____ How important is the proposed research in advancing knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields?

____ How well qualified is the proposer (individual or team) to conduct the research?

____ To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative and original concepts?

____ How well conceived, organized, and clear is the proposal?

____ Is there sufficient access to resources?

____ What are the broader impacts of the research?

____ TOTAL score

Notes on the proposal review process:
• Ranking criteria are closely adapted from those of the National Science Foundation.
• While NSF strictly disqualifies proposers from scoring competitors, as a conflict of interest, NASA routinely permits this practice. Go figure.
• Proposals with high enough ratings will be funded, within limits. $50 each was requested for student research projects (though Physics of Astronomy, like all Evergreen programs this year, was underfunded).
• Proposal approval is at the discretion of the program officer (in this case, the professor).