USRG Reviewer Form

Proposal Number: **Applicant's Name:**
Department: **Number of Years at K-State:**
Summary:

Evaluation Criteria	Range	Score	Comments
Priority Weighting			
Years at K-State: 5 pts ≤ 3years; 3 pts > 3 & ≤ 5 years, 1 pt > 5 years; 3 pts--at K-State > 5 yrs but shifting research fields or specialties, mastery of new techniques, or change of appointment	1, 3, 5		
Funding level: **10:** No startup funds or discipline where limited funding is available; **8:** preliminary data or background research needed to obtain extramural funding (should be specific about potential funder and if already has external funding why this cannot be used)—; **6:** new research/scholarship direction, no external funding; **1-6:** discipline where medium level of funding avialable-should explain why project is not externally fundable; **0:** large startup, extensive outside funding, or no tie made to external funding.	0-10		
Non-Narrative			
Is the budget well laid out, justified and complete with documentation (Orbitz/official equipment quotes) and explanation for the costs?	0 to 10		
Is project timeline well laid out?	0 to 5		
How well does the department head's letter form support the PI's proposed project? Is the form complete?	0 to 5		
Abstract/Narrative			
Does abstract summarize the proposal well?	0 to 5		
Does the proposal have a well articulated overall goal as well as objectives that logically follow from this goal?	0 to 10		
Is the approach/project activities section understandable and well laid out? Does it logically follow from the stated goal and objectives? Is the project design logical and complete? If a survey will be used, it is included and has the human subjects paperwork been submitted? Does the project seem achievable as described?	0 to 15		
Is the significance and expect outcomes of the proposed project well explained? How about the benefit of the project to K-State?	0 to 5		
How well does the proposal address how the proposed project fits into the PIs overall career and research plans?	0 to 10		
How well articulated/thought out are the PI's plans to 1) submit to an outside funding source, 2) develop a showing/exhibition, or 3) develop a scholarly work that follows from this research?	0 to 10		
Overall			
Overall impression of this submission: take into account how well (e.g., outputs/outcomes) previous FDA/USRG funding has been utilized. Is the narrative well laid out and organized?	0 to 10		
Total	0 to 100	0	

Strengths:

Weaknesses/Suggestions for Improvement:

Overall Recommendation: Fund-High Priority; Fund-Lower Priority; Fund if Can-High; Fund if Can-Low; Do not Fund	