Evaluation Guidelines for Exploratory/Developmental Research Grant (EDRG) Åward

| Name of PI and/or Co-PIs: _ | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Title of Project: | |
| Option: 1 2 3 | |

| Score | Descriptor | Advice |
|-------|--------------|---|
| 1 | Exceptional | Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses |
| 2 | Outstanding | Very Strong with negligible weaknesses |
| 3 | Excellent | Very Strong with only some minor weaknesses |
| 4 | Very Good | Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses |
| 5 | Good | Strong with at least one moderate weakness |
| 6 | Satisfactory | Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses |
| 7 | Fair | Some strengths but with at least one major weakness |
| 8 | Marginal | A few strengths and a few major weaknesses |
| 9 | Poor | Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses |

| | Score | Descriptor | Advice | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | 1 | Exceptional | Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses | | | |
| | 2 | Outstanding | Very Strong with negligible weaknesses | | | |
| | 3 | Excellent | Very Strong with only some minor weaknesses | | | |
| | 4 | Very Good | Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses | | | |
| | 5 | Good | Strong with at least one moderate weakness | | | |
| | 6 | Satisfactory | Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses | | | |
| | 7 | Fair | Some strengths but with at least one major weakness | | | |
| | 8 | Marginal | A few strengths and a few major weaknesses | | | |
| | 9 | Poor | Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses | | | |
| | Adapted fr | om the National Institute | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1. Clear | Specific A | Aims | | | | |
| Score: | _ | | | | | |
| Comme | nts: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 2. Signi | ficance of | the research | | | | |
| Score: | | | | | | |
| Comme | nts: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 3. Innov | ation | | | | | |
| Score: | | | | | | |
| Comme | | | | | | |
| Comme | 1105 | | | | | |
| 4. Clear | · approach | and methodology. | Not overly ambitious. | | | |
| Score: | | | , | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 5. Clear | and justi | fied budget | | | | |
| Score: | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 6. Identification of | | | | | | |
| extramural | | | | | | |
| funding/sponsors | | | | | | |
| Score: | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 7. Clear | · collabora | tive effort | | | | |
| (Option 3 only) | | | | | | |
| Score: | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Total So | Total Score: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| The project is positioned to support future funded projects? Yes Marginal No Additional Comments | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Proposal Strengths: | Proposal Deficiencies: | | | |
| ☐ Potential to grow into future significant projects ☐ Appropriate and justified budget | ☐ Have not specified future sources of funding ☐ Inadequate justification of budget | | | |
| ☐ Clearly advances the faculty members' scholarship efforts | ☐ Inadequate proposal description | | | |
| ☐ Well-presented proposal description | ☐ Failure to follow instructions or provide sufficient information needed for evaluation | | | |
| ☐ Provided all information needed for evaluation ☐ Likely to lead to significant scholarly contributions | ☐ Unclear how scholarship will lead to significant scholarly contributions ☐ Other (specify) | | | |
| ☐ Other (specify) | | | | |