

University Interdisciplinary Grant Evaluation Form

Reviewer Name: _____

Date: _____

PI Name: _____

PI College and Department: _____

Proposal Title: _____

Confidentiality Statement

The Office of Sponsored Programs and Research will maintain your anonymity as a reviewer to the maximum extent possible. As a reviewer you agree to:

- treat the evaluation forms, proposal and other submitted materials with appropriate confidentiality;
- not copy, quote or otherwise use material from this proposal; and
- destroy the proposal following review.

I affirm that I will comply with the bullets listed above. Yes No

Conflict of Interest

Please review the names of the PI and collaborators on the assigned proposal. Reviewers are considered to have a conflict of interest if they have shared a grant with the investigators in the past 3 years or share an affiliation or financial connection that would prevent the reviewer from objectively reviewing the proposal.

Have you shared a grant with the investigators in the past 3 years? Yes No

Do you have an affiliation or financial connection with the investigators? Yes No

If you answered yes to any of the COI questions, please describe those interests on the *UIG Reviewer Conflict of Interest Form*.

Instructions

Please evaluate the proposal according to how the proposal adequately addresses the requirements of each criteria. Please circle the number that best represents your views for each criteria and calculate your total score at the end of this document. Your substantive written comments on the proposal's strengths, weaknesses and suggestions for improvement are critical to the evaluation. Completed evaluation forms, minus the names of the reviewers, may be provided to the applicant at the conclusion of the review process. Comments should be insightful and respectful. Please avoid text that will identify you.

Scoring Criteria

Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weakness
1	Outstanding	Extremely strong with no or negligible weaknesses
2	Very Good	Strong with some minor weaknesses
3	Satisfactory	Some strengths with at least one moderate weaknesses
4	Fair	Few strengths with a few major weaknesses
5	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen career development

Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens career development potential

Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits career development potential

Reviewer’s Evaluation

Criteria: The proposed project will develop, strengthen and consistent the PI’s professional field, such as: improve technical skills, analytical skills, teaching or mentoring of students.

Outstanding	Very Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor
1	2	3	4	5

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Criteria: The budget separately list expenditures for commodities, services, travel, equipment and staff time. According to the budget justification, the amount requested is appropriate for the proposed work.

Outstanding	Very Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor
1	2	3	4	5

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Criteria: The proposed activity is innovative and objectives would be a significant achievement and represent a meaningful advance in the field.

Outstanding	Very Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor
1	2	3	4	5

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Criteria: The PI and collaborators have appropriate backgrounds, expertise, experience, training and capabilities for the proposed work.

Outstanding	Very Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor
1	2	3	4	5

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Criteria: If the requested project is funded, the PI and collaborators have the resources and facilities to achieve the objectives.

Outstanding	Very Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor
1	2	3	4	5

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Criteria: There are no significant concerns regarding compliance, including human subjects, animal subjects or biosafety approvals.

Outstanding	Very Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor
1	2	3	4	5

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Criteria: The project is likely to result in a competitive extramural application.

Outstanding	Very Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor
1	2	3	4	5

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Criteria: Overall the proposed project would be an asset to GSU and the GSU community.

Outstanding	Very Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor
1	2	3	4	5

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Suggestions for Improvement:

Please add each of the criteria scores that you circled and place the total here. **Total Score** _____