GEO 444 – Advanced Modeling
Instructions for Proposal Review

INSTRUCTIONS: Please evaluate the application with respect to the criteria listed below. Organize your comments for items 1 through 6 sequentially. Provide a numerical rating for each of the relevant criteria (see below for explanation). In arriving at a summary score, equal weight does not necessarily have to be placed on each criterion, but be sure to explain the rationale of the summary score. Investigators will receive copies of the written reviews, so comments should be constructive and worded in a way that protects the reviewer’s anonymity. Contact with the applicant concerning this review is strictly prohibited.

RANK:

- *Exceptional* (top 2%, highest scientific merit) 5
- *Excellent* (top 15%, definitely should be supported) 4
- *Very Good* (top 33%, few minor deficiencies – easily corrected) 3
- *Good* (top 50%, numerous minor deficiencies) 2
- *Fair* (bottom 50%, major deficiencies) 1
- *Unacceptable* (insurmountable problems – fundamental flaws) 0

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. QUALITY of the proposed work (originality and creativity). Are the objectives clear? Is there a strong rationale?

2. SIGNIFICANCE or importance of the project. What is the likely intellectual contribution to the academic field?

3. Broader IMPACT of the project. For example, how might the outcome influence related scientific disciplines, societal concerns, and (or) the educational mission of the host institution?

4. DESIGN and procedures. Are the procedures appropriate to achieve the stated goals? Are they innovative and well designed? Can the project be completed in the time allowed? Are the logistics realistic?

5. RESOURCES and environment. Does the proponent have access to all necessary support facilities, equipment, services, intellectual resources, and data?

6. SUMMARY evaluation.

SUBMITTAL OF REVIEW

Send review comments via E-mail to GEO 444 Program Director at ewpeter@ilstu.edu

Include the following information at the top of the message:

- Investigator’s Last Name:
- Reviewer’s Last Name:
- Quality =
- Significance =
- Impact =
- Design =
- Resources =
- Summary Score =

Include written justification for each review category, organized in sequential order.