

External Peer Review Scoring Rubric
NSF-format review criteria

Name of Principle Investigator:

Title of Proposal:

Date review completed:

Overall Score

Rating Scale : Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor

Please provide written justification and the factors that were considered for your overall impact score in the space provided here:

SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA

Please consider each of the review criteria below in the determination of scientific and technical merit, and give a separate score for each.

External Peer Review Scoring Rubric
NSF-format review criteria

<p>Intellectual Merit Rating Scale : Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor</p> <p>In the context of the five review elements, please evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal with respect to intellectual merit.</p> <p>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>1)What is the potential for the project to advance and/or transform the frontiers of knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ In the field■ For society	<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p>
<p>Rating Scale : Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor</p> <p>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>2)Assess creativity, originality of concept, potential to transform</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p>

External Peer Review Scoring Rubric
NSF-format review criteria

<p>Rating Scale : Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor</p> <p>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Very Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Fair <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Poor <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>3)Is the Approach/research plan well-conceived and organized with a solid premise; does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success?</p>	
<p>Rating Scale : Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor</p> <p>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Very Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Fair <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Poor <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>4)Is the PI/team qualified to undertake the proposed work; if early career, do they have appropriate experience/training; Is the team well-rounded and inclusive of expertise needed to succeed</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p>
<p>Rating Scale : Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor</p>	<p>5)Are the necessary resources available to carry out a successful</p>	<p>Strengths:</p>

External Peer Review Scoring Rubric
NSF-format review criteria

<p>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Very Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Fair <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Poor <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>project (institutional support, equipment, other resources)</p>	<p>Weaknesses:</p>
<p>Broader Impacts</p> <p>Rating Scale : Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor</p> <p>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Very Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Fair <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Poor <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>What potential does the project offer to benefit society and contribute to desired societal outcomes;</p> <p>Please consider the five review elements above</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p>

External Peer Review Scoring Rubric
NSF-format review criteria

ADDITIONAL REVIEW CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION

DATA MANAGEMENT PLAN

Comments:

POST-DOCTORAL MENTORING PLAN (if applicable)

Comments (if applicable):

BUDGET AND PERIOD OF SUPPORT

Comments:

RESUBMISSION (if applicable)

Comments (if applicable):

RENEWAL (if applicable)

Comments (if applicable):

External Peer Review Scoring Rubric
NSF-format review criteria

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO APPLICANT

Reviewers may provide guidance to the applicant or recommend against resubmission without fundamental revision.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO APPLICANT (optional)