

OCN791 – Scientific Proposal Preparation and Evaluation
Proposal Review Assignment

Due: Electronically (email to zij@hawaii.edu) Nov 17 (#1/2) and Nov 19 (#3)

Length: 0.5 – 1page

Assignment:

For each of your 3 assigned proposals, write a 0.5-1 page review addressing the NSF criteria listed below. Additionally at the top of the review please provide a whole number numerical evaluation (1-5, 1 = outstanding 5 = poor) for the proposal. The purpose of this review is to provide constructive feedback for the person who wrote the proposal and to evaluate the proposal's potential to be funded. In the context of the criteria, please comment on both positive and negative features of the proposal and offer collegial suggestions for improving its quality. In short, please generate the type of feedback that you would find helpful. As at NSF, the authorship of the review will be revealed to the panel and program manager, but not to the PI.

From the NSF Grant Proposal Guide (08-1):

The National Science Foundation strives to conduct a fair, competitive, transparent merit-review process for the selection of projects. All NSF proposals are evaluated through use of two National Science Board approved merit review criteria. In some instances, however, NSF will employ additional criteria as required to highlight the specific objectives of certain programs and activities. For example, proposals for large facility projects also might be subject to special review criteria outlined in the program solicitation. The two merit review criteria are listed below. The criteria include considerations that help define them. These considerations are suggestions, and not all will apply to any given proposal. While proposers must address both merit review criteria, reviewers will be asked to address only those considerations that are relevant to the proposal being considered and for which the reviewer is qualified to make judgments.

What is the intellectual merit of the proposed activity?

How important is the proposed activity to advancing knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields? How well qualified is the proposer (individual or team) to conduct the project? (If appropriate, the reviewer will comment on the quality of prior work.) To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts? How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity? Is there sufficient access to resources?

What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity?

How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while promoting teaching, training, and learning? How well does the proposed activity broaden the participation of underrepresented groups (e.g. gender, ethnicity, disability, geographic, etc.)? To what extent will it enhance the infrastructure for research and education, such as facilities, instrumentation, networks, and partnerships? Will the results be disseminated broadly to enhance scientific and technological understanding? What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society?