## LONG APPLICATION RATING FORM

Reviewer's Identification Number:		(no name please)					
Date	:						
Princ	ipal Investigator(s):						
Propo	osal Number:						
Appli	cation Title:						
Section	on A. Summary of Ratings:						
Pleas	e complete the questions belo	ow, then fill in t	his summary	•			
	Statement		Circled Number		Weighting Factor		Subrating
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	Objectives Achievability Methodology Contribution Awareness Background Project Management Equipment Purchase Facilities Budget			X X X X X X X X X X	9 9 7 7 5 5 2 2 2 2 7 Total: 50	= = = = = = =	250 points possible
critic	While points are necessary al to truly understanding the aximum extent possible.			-			
Overa	all Recommendation:		Fund				
	-		Funding Ma	у В	e Considere	d	
	-		Do Not Fund	d			

## Section B. Ratings and Comments:

Please circle your response to each statement and transfer the number circled to the column entitled "Circled Number" on the first page of this form. Also, please comment on each criteria.

1. The objectives or goals of the proposed project with respect to clarity and consistency with North Dakota Industrial Commission/Lignite Research Council goals are: 1 – very unclear; 2 – unclear; 3 – clear; 4 – very clear; or 5 – exceptionally clear.

Please comment:

2. With the approach suggested and time and budget available, the objectives are: 1 - not achievable; 2 - possibly achievable; 3 - likely achievable; 4 - most likely achievable; or 5 - certainly achievable.

Please comment:

3.	The quality of the methodology displayed in the proposal is: 1 – well below average; 2 – below average; 3 – average; 4 – above average; or 5 – well above average.
	Please comment:
1.	The scientific and/or technical contribution of the proposed work to specifically address North Dakota Industrial Commission/Lignite Research Council goals will likely be: 1 – extremely small; 2 – small; 3 – significant; 4 – very significant; or 5 – extremely significant.
	Please comment:

5.	The principal investigator's awareness of current research activity and published literature as evidenced by literature referenced and its interpretation and by the reference to unpublished research related to the proposal is: $1 - \text{very limited}$ ; $2 - \text{limited}$ ; $3 - \text{adequate}$ ; $4 - \text{better than average}$ ; or $5 - \text{exceptional}$ .
	Please comment:
6.	The background of the investigator(s) as related to the proposed work is: $1 - \text{very limited}$ ; $2 - \text{limited}$ ; $3 - \text{adequate}$ ; $4 - \text{better than average}$ ; or $5 - \text{exceptional}$ .
	Please comment:

7.	The project management plan, including a well-defined milestone chart, schedule, financial plan, and plan for communications among the investigators and subcontractors, if any, is: $1 - \text{very}$ inadequate; $2 - \text{inadequate}$ ; $3 - \text{adequate}$ ; $4 - \text{very}$ good; or $5 - \text{exceptionally}$ good.
	Please comment:
8.	The proposed purchase of equipment is: $1$ – extremely poorly justified; $2$ – poorly justified; $3$ – justified; $4$ – well justified; or $5$ – extremely well justified. (Circle $5$ if no equipment is to be purchased.)
	Please comment:

9.	The facilities and equipment available and to be purchased for the proposed research are: 1 – very inadequate; 2 – inadequate; 3 – adequate; 4 – notably good; or 5 – exceptionally good.
	Please comment:
10.	The proposed budget "value" relative to the outlined work and the <u>financial commitment from other sources</u> is of: 1 – very low value; 2 – low value; 3 – average value; 4 – high value; or 5 – very high value. (See below)
	Please comment:
1 65 7_1	ue" – The value of the projected work and technical outcome for the budgeted amount of the project, based or
	stimate of what the work might cost in research settings with which you are familiar.

<u>Financial commitment from other sources</u> – A <u>minimum</u> of 50% of the total project must come from other than Industrial Commission sources to meet the program guidelines. Support less than 50% from Industrial Commission sources should be evaluated as favorable to the application.

## Section C. Overall Comments and Recommendations:

Please comment in a general way about the merits and flaws of the proposed project and make a recommendation whether or not to fund.

General comments: