

**Research Proposal Rating Sheets**  
Physics of Astronomy Week 9 - Winter 2006

Instructions to Reviewers:

- Rate each proposal after you have heard the complete presentation.
- Score each criterion on a scale of 1-5, with 5 for the top score.
- Include LEGIBLE comments explaining your ranking of each criterion.
- Write your name legibly on BACK of each rating sheet. Copies of the front will be provided to Proposers (Reviewers will be kept confidential).
- Review your rankings for mutual consistency, as far as possible.
- Try not to be swayed by personal feelings for proposers or outside influences.
- Turn in your rankings to the TA after ALL presentations are complete.

Proposer(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Proposal: \_\_\_\_\_

SCORE:

\_\_\_\_\_ What is the intellectual merit of the proposed research?

\_\_\_\_\_ How important is the proposed research in advancing knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields?

\_\_\_\_\_ How well qualified is the proposer (individual or team) to conduct the research?

\_\_\_\_\_ To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative and original concepts?

\_\_\_\_\_ How well conceived, organized, and clear is the proposal?

\_\_\_\_\_ Is there sufficient access to resources?

\_\_\_\_\_ What are the broader impacts of the research?

\_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL score

---

Notes on the proposal review process:

- Ranking criteria are closely adapted from those of the National Science Foundation.
- While NSF strictly disqualifies proposers from scoring competitors, as a conflict of interest, NASA routinely permits this practice. Go figure.
- Proposals with high enough ratings will be funded, within limits. \$50 each was requested for student research projects (though Physics of Astronomy, like all Evergreen programs this year, was underfunded).
- Proposal approval is at the discretion of the program officer (in this case, the professor).