Peer Review Form for Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant
College Program Large Project Proposal

Reviewer:
Principal Investigator:
Title: Date:

OVERALL PROPOSAL RATING

☐   A   Excellent – A truly meritorious research project

☐   B   Good – A research project that clearly deserves support but to which minor improvements are
        recommended in order to achieve desired outcomes

☐   C   Adequate – A research project that should be supported, assuming major reservations related to achieving
        desired outcomes can be addressed

☐   D   Questionable – A research project about which reservations are so serious that it should be supported
        only in exceptional circumstances

MERIT OF PROPOSED RESEARCH

Question	High		Medium		Low
• Do the researchers demonstrate adequate awareness of significant present or previous work? Does their study logically relate to it?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Are the objectives clearly stated?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Are the methods appropriate and feasible? Are they innovative?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Will the data be analyzed in an appropriate way?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Is the proposed time frame adequate to complete the project?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Are facilities, management structure and partnership arrangements sufficient to produce expected impacts?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Are appropriate levels of program resources (FTEs and budget) dedicated to achieve expected impacts? Is the budget reasonable?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Is the research team qualified to perform the work?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

IMPACTS OF PROPOSED RESEARCH

Question	High		Medium		Low
• Is the problem to be addressed a valid and significant one? Does it address the research questions and data gaps outlined in the RFP?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Will the data generated by this project significantly advance the scientific body of knowledge?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Do the researchers clearly identify potential users of the information being developed in the project?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Do the researchers describe effective ways to communicate results of the project?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

CONSTRUCTIVE COMMENTS: Please attach additional comments on the back of this page or in a new
document. Anonymous comments will be relayed to Principal Investigator unless you indicate otherwise.

Additional comments:

Peer Review Form for Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant
College Program <u>Small Project Proposal</u>

Reviewer:
Principal Investigator:
Title: Date:

OVERALL PROPOSAL RATING

- ☐ A — Excellent – Truly meritorious & fundable research project that will clearly result in improved research outcomes or strong proposals to larger funding agencies
- ☐ B — Good – A good research project that deserves support, but to which minor improvements are recommended in order to achieve desired outcomes
- ☐ C — Adequate – A research project that should be supported assuming major concerns related to achieving desired outcomes can be addressed
- ☐ D — Questionable – A research project about which reservations are so serious that it should be supported only in exceptional circumstances

TECHNICAL MERIT OF PROPOSED RESEARCH

Question	High		Medium		Low
• Keeping in mind the page limit of the proposal narrative, do the researchers demonstrate adequate knowledge of previous work in their proposed area of study?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Are the objectives clearly stated?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Are the methods, including analysis, appropriate and feasible? Are they innovative?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Does the research team describe sufficient resources to achieve expected impacts?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Is the budget reasonable?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Is the research team qualified to perform the work?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF PROPOSED RESEARCH

Question	High		Medium		Low
• Is the problem to be addressed a valid and significant one?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Does the proposed work fit with priority areas, research questions, or data gaps identified in the RFP?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Do the researchers clearly describe how their study will complement previous work or provide a strong basis for future work?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• Do the researchers identify potential users of the information being developed through the project?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

CONSTRUCTIVE COMMENTS: Please attach additional comments on the back of this page or in a new document. Anonymous comments will be relayed to Principal Investigator unless you indicate otherwise.

Additional comments: