

KY NSF EPSCoR Proposal Review Form

This review is for the following proposal (please complete these three fields):

(1) Principal Investigator:

(2) Institution:

(3) Title of the Proposed Project:

Please evaluate this proposal according to the criteria below. Your substantive written comments on the proposal's strengths and weaknesses are critical to the evaluation.

Criterion 1: 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 and original concepts? How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity? Is there sufficient access to resources?

▼ *(Reviewer's comments on Criterion 1 here)*

Criterion 2: 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?

▼ *(Reviewer's comments on Criterion 2 here)*

Criterion 3: Future Competitiveness

Excellent science is, of course, an important review consideration of the REG program. By itself, however, it is not enough. REG awardees are required to submit a follow-on proposal directly to a federal agency within a reasonable amount of time after their REG award has ended. KY NSF EPSCoR prioritizes awards that indicate a logical and realistic plan for using EPSCoR dollars to generate future federal research dollars. To what extent does the researcher convey a clear plan for securing future federal funding? Does the research identify specific federal agencies/programs that they will target for future submissions?

▼ *(Reviewer's comments on Criterion 3 here)*

Criterion 4: Prior KY EPSCoR Support (if applicable)

Reviewers are provided with a summary listing of prior KY EPSCoR support made to a given researcher. The program solicitation instructs those who have received an award before that they should identify and briefly detail any prior KY EPSCoR support, which may or may not relate to the current proposal. If applicable, did the researcher address prior EPSCoR support within the body of the project description?

▼ (Reviewer's comments on Criterion 4 here)

Criterion 5: Is the proposed activity area prioritized by the State?

KY NSF EPSCoR programs prioritize research areas that are also prioritized by the State. Accordingly, please indicate if the proposed research incorporates any/all of the research areas prioritized by Kentucky.

▼ *KY Research Priority Areas (Reviewer's Note: These are not mutually exclusive. Please "X" all that apply.)*

- Human Health and Development
- Biosciences
- Cellular and Molecular Engineering
- Information Technology and Communications
- Environmental and Energy Technologies
- Material Science and Advanced Manufacturing
- Nanotechnology
- Ecological Genomics
- Bio NEMS/MEMS

Overall Recommendation:

Please provide your overall funding recommendation for this proposal on a scale from 1 to 10, with “10”=“HIGHEST RECOMMENDATION FOR FUNDING”, and “1”=“DO NOT FUND”. There is not a formal calculation for this rating. Ratings should simply reflect the reviewer’s overall impression of the proposal, considering all review factors.

▼ *Reviewer’s Overall Proposal Rating (1-10 Scale)*

***Reviewer’s Signature:** _____ **Date:** _____

I understand that the information above will be anonymously shared with the proposer to provide them with constructive feedback and recommendations. This peer-review represents my unbiased opinion on the review questions posed.

*** Reviewers identities will not be shared with the proposers.**