

PROPOSAL REVIEW FORM

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

TITLE

- **Criterion 1: Does the proposal comply with the proposal preparation instructions?**
- **Criterion 2: Is the objective clearly stated?**
- **Criterion 3: Is the scope of the project reasonable and the project itself feasible?**
- **Criterion 4: Is the technical narrative scientifically sound?**
- **Criterion 5: Has enough detail been provided to allow adequate evaluation?**
- **Criterion 6: Have the proposers anticipated and answered potential objections?**
- **Criterion 7: Have all parts of the proposal been included?**

Your specific comments on the proposal's strengths and weaknesses are critical. Do not share, copy, quote, or otherwise use or disclose material from this proposal. Destroy it after you complete your review.

Summary Statement (Include comments on the relative importance of the criteria in assigning your rating. Continue on additional pages, if necessary):

Overall Rating (check one) :

- Excellent:** Outstanding proposal in all respects; deserves highest priority for support.
 - Very Good:** High quality proposal in nearly all respects; should be supported if at all possible.
 - Good:** A quality proposal, worthy of support.
 - Fair:** Proposal lacking in one or more critical aspects; key issues need to be addressed.
 - Poor:** Proposal has serious deficiencies.
-

YOUR IDENTITY WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL

The Department of Physics keeps reviews and your identity as a reviewer of specific proposals confidential to the maximum extent possible. We will, however, send the principal investigator(s) a copy of this review without your name and affiliation.

REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE:

REVIEWER'S NAME (printed):

OTHER SUGGESTED REVIEWERS (OPTIONAL)

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR REVIEWERS

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

If you have an affiliation, collaboration, or financial connection with the institution or person submitting a proposal that might be presumed to create a conflict of interest, you must disclose it to the agency requesting your review. Describe those affiliations, collaborations, and financial or other interests on a separate page and attach it to your review. If you believe you cannot be objective, return the proposal without review.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE PROPOSAL

Reviewers are expected to protect the confidentiality of proposal contents. For this reason, you must not copy, quote from, or otherwise use or disclose to anyone, including your graduate students or post-doctoral or research associates, any material from any proposal you are asked to review. Unauthorized disclosure of confidential information could subject you to administrative sanctions by the funding agency. If you believe a colleague could make a substantial contribution to the review, you should obtain permission from the funding agency before disclosing either the contents of the proposal or the name of any applicant or principal investigator. When you have completed a review, you should destroy the proposal.

ANONYMITY OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

Reviewers are expected to maintain their anonymity. Although it is acceptable to indicate that you have acted as a reviewer for a funding agency on your CV, you may not disclose the titles of the proposals that you reviewed or the names of the investigators. You should not disclose to any of the investigators that you served as a reviewer on his or her proposal.