

Ralph E. Powe Junior Faculty Enhancement Awards 2020
Internal Competition Review Criteria

Criterion: Scientific/Technical Merit

To the best of your ability to assess based on the proposal, what is the scientific/technical merit of the proposed project? Is there a clearly demonstrated need for this work? Do you understand, at a high level, why this project is important?

(0 = unable to assess; 1 = poor or absent; 2 = poor to fair; 3 = fair; 4 = fair to good; 5=good; 6 = good to very good; 7 = very good; 8 = very good to excellent; 9=excellent)

Criterion: Proposed Method/Approach

To the best of your ability to assess based on the proposal, how appropriate is the proposed method or approach? Is the approach novel? Potentially transformative? Well justified? Do you understand, at a high level what the applicant is proposing to do? Are the writing and graphics clear, concise, correct, and compelling? Are the research goals and objective present and easy to identify and understand? Do they seem reasonable? Are they compelling? Are the expected outcomes given? Do they seem relevant? Realistic?

(0 = unable to assess; 1 = poor or absent; 2 = poor to fair; 3 = fair; 4 = fair to good; 5=good; 6 = good to very good; 7 = very good; 8 = very good to excellent; 9=excellent)

Criterion: Applicant's research performance competence/adequacy of facilities/resources to conduct the proposed research

To the best of your ability to assess based on the proposal, what is the ability of the applicant to complete the proposed work in the setting and timeframe proposed?

(0 = unable to assess; 1 = poor or absent; 2 = poor to fair; 3 = fair; 4 = fair to good; 5=good; 6 = good to very good; 7 = very good; 8 = very good to excellent; 9=excellent)

Criterion: Likelihood research will lead to fundable research and/or publishable work

To the best of your ability to assess based on the proposal, what is the likelihood that the research will lead to fundable research and/or publishable work? Are any specific examples of likely funding opportunities or publication channels convincingly proposed?

(0 = unable to assess; 1 = poor or absent; 2 = poor to fair; 3 = fair; 4 = fair to good; 5=good; 6 = good to very good; 7 = very good; 8 = very good to excellent; 9=excellent)

Criterion: Overall quality of application

What is the overall quality of the application—both on its own merit, and also compared to other proposals you reviewed? Are the writing and graphics clear, concise, correct, and compelling? How competitive do you think it will be in the ORAU competition?

(0 = unable to assess; 1 = poor or absent; 2 = poor to fair; 3 = fair; 4 = fair to good; 5=good; 6 = good to very good; 7 = very good; 8 = very good to excellent; 9=excellent)

Overall Comments:

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement: