J. Peer Reviewer Project/Program Evaluation Form

This sample Peer Review Evaluation Form would be filled out by reviewers after the presentations and before leaving the review site. This form would be modified depending on the specific questions addressed in the review. The rating scheme may also be modified, for example, to use a five part scale such as very poor, marginal, average, good, and very good.

Reviewer #: _____ Project/Subprogram/Program: Date of Review: _____

Instructions: Reviewers individually rate the program/subprogram/project using three criteria, provide an overall project rating, and add supporting comments for each. The rating scale for each is composed of integer values from one to ten, with the ends of the scale representing seriously deficient and outstanding attributes, respectively. If more space is required for comment, please use the comment continuation sheet.

Q1. Quality, Productivity, and Accomplishments

Reviewers assess the overall quality, productivity, and record of accomplishments of the project (or set of projects/activities) or program. For quality and productivity, this includes assessment of:

a) Quality -- the composition and quality of the resources engaged, including people and facilities. Considered are the team members' honors and awards, their relevant experience relevant, and the balance of appropriate skills (including collaborators). [For example: A project team may be outstanding, strong, balanced and experienced; good but would benefit from additional skills; require strengthening; or have serious shortcomings.]

b) Productivity -- the level of productivity in work underway is assessed by looking at accomplishments and the value of the accomplishments compared to costs. This includes achievement against planned goals and objectives, technical targets, awards, or other success measures typical for the type of activity (such as publications, citations, patents, licenses, prototypes passing requirements tests). [For example: The levels of productivity may have been exceptional, extensive, reasonable under the circumstances, marginal, or have little evidence of progress.]

ality:		Circle the appropriate number for your rating.											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			
Very	low qual	ity							١	Very high quality			
Suppor	rting Co	mmen	its:										

Productivity:	Circl	e the ap	propria	te numb	per for y	our rat	ting.	
1 2 Low productivity	3	4	5	6	7			10 roductivity
Supporting Comm	ents:							
ccomplishments:	Circl	e the ap	propria	te numb	per for y	our rat	ting.	
1 2 No accomplishmen	3 its	4	5	6	7	8	9 Many a	10 ccomplishments
Supporting Comm	ents:							

Q2. Relevance

Reviewers assess the importance of achieving the project's objectives in terms of actual or potential contribution to the broader program and Department mission, goals, or strategy and to society. In many cases relevance also means that the set of activities addresses known technical or market barriers and that tasks being performed are able to demonstrate actual or potential contributions to lowering one or more of those barriers.

Levels of relevance could be: of central importance to larger program goals or strategy, of significant importance, of general importance, weakly support the program goals or strategy, or of doubtful or peripheral importance.

Relevance to Mission, Goals, or Strategy and to Society:

Circle the appropriate number for your rating.

Not V Support	1 Very Re ing Co	elevant	3 ts:	4	5	6	7	8	9 V	10 ery Relevant	

Relevance to Technical and/or Market Barriers:

	Circle	the ap	propria	te num	ber for	your r	ating.	
1 Not Very R Supporting Co			4	5	6	7	8	10 Very Relevant

Q3. Project/Subprogram/Program Management

The management criterion examines how well projects and programs are managed. This includes quality of research planning (past and future), and program execution which may include effective research integration, good application and leveraging of resources.

Management may be judged as: expert and innovative approach with exceptional execution, logical approach and effective execution, reasonable approach and appropriate execution with room for improvement, or an approach with key shortcomings and poor execution.

Circle the appropriate number for your rating.

Ve	1 ry Poo		3	4	5	6	7	8	9 10 Outstanding
Support	ing Co	omme	nts:						

Q4. Overall Impressions

Please provide your general overall rating of the project/subprogram/program, followed by comments.

Overall Rating

Circle the appropriate number for your rating.										
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Very P	oor								Outstanding	

Supporting Comments:

Areas of comment include (a) overall strengths and weaknesses, (b) areas of research or analysis that could be deleted, (c) new areas or directions that could be added, and (d) changes that may have occurred in the research context (markets, policy, competing technologies, etc.) that might alter the planned targets or goals.

