

Research Full Proposal Review Form (2022-2024) Pennsylvania Sea Grant College Program

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

If you have any academic affiliations, personal relationship, or financial interests with the institution or the proposed principal investigator(s) submitting this proposal that could be construed as creating a conflict of interest, please describe those affiliations or interests in your own words below, *and attach it to your review*.

Regardless of any such affiliations or interests, unless you believe you cannot be objective, we would like to have your review. If you attach no description of affiliations or interests that could be construed as creating a conflict of interest, we shall assume that you have no such affiliations or interests.

FULL PROPOSAL REVIEW FORM

Principal Investigator:		Please Return By: July 21, 2021			
Title:					
Please rate the proposal on the following elements and provide an overall rating in the Overall Rating Section. Use the explanation of rating factors on the next page as a guide.					
Factor (15 points each)	Excellent (15)	Good (12)	Adequate (9)	Questionable (6)	Poor (3)
A. Rationale and Relevance					
B. Scientific Merit					
C. Outreach Plan					
Factor (10 points each)	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Adequate (6)	Questionable (4)	Poor (2)
D. Innovation					
E. Application					
F. Methodology					
G. Student Involvement					
Factor (5 points each)	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Adequate (3)	Questionable (2)	Poor (1)
H. Successful Completion in Proposed Timeframe					
I. Successful Completion with Available Resources					
J. Qualifications of Investigators/Collaborators					
<i>Total Score</i>					
Note: <i>Excellent</i> – A truly meritorious research project. <i>Good</i> – A project that clearly deserves support. <i>Adequate</i> – A project that is good enough to be supported, with certain reservations. <i>Questionable</i> – A project about which reservations are so serious that it should be supported only in exceptional circumstances. <i>Poor</i> – A project that should not be funded under any circumstances.					
OVERALL RATING: Excellent ____ Good ____ Adequate ____ Questionable ____ Poor ____					

COMMENTS, EVALUATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS*

***Note: We are interested in any comments you may offer, but the following are most helpful:**

- **Are objectives clear?**
- **Can you determine the work content from the methodology?**
- **Did the proposal demonstrate how results would be useful and applied?**
- **Is there a described plan of completing the work and transferring results?**
- **Is there a description of application and users?**
- **How can the proposal be improved?**

Use Additional Pages if Necessary

REQUIRED SIGNATURE ON NEXT PAGE

EXPLANATION OF RATING FACTORS

- A. Rationale and Relevance** – How well does the proposed research addresses an important issue, problem, or opportunity relating to the priority focus areas identified in the RFP, and is the problem to be addressed valid?
- B. Scientific Merit** – Is the proposed research scientifically sound, and does it have the potential to advance our current understanding of the problem?
- C. Outreach** – Does the proposal include a strong outreach plan? Have potential applications of the research and end-users of those applications been identified; and has a method of information dissemination been identified?
- D. Innovation** – To what degree will new approaches be employed to solve problems and exploit opportunities and to what degree will the project focus on new types of important or potentially important resources and issues?
- E. Application** – Are potential results beneficial and applicable?
- F. Methodology** – Are the proposed approach(es) appropriate to achieve the stated objectives. Are the methods appropriate for meeting the objectives? Will the data be analyzed in an appropriate way?
- G. Student Involvement** – Will students be actively involved in the research?
- H. Successful Completion in Timeframe** – Can the project be completed in the stated timeframe?
- I. Successful Completion with Resources** - Is the proposed budget realistic?
- J. Qualifications of Investigators** – Are the listed investigators qualified to perform the work?

Please return the conflict of interest statement and electronically signed review form to Sean Rafferty (srafferty@psu.edu) by July 21, 2021.

Although signed copies of reviews will be made available to the National Sea Grant College Program, only anonymous copies of ratings and comments will be provided to the project’s principal investigator(s). Subject to applicable laws, reviewers’ identities will be given maximum protection from disclosure.

Reviewer’s Name, Address, Phone, and E-mail _____

Reviewer’s e-Signature _____ **Date** _____