

## RESEARCH PROPOSAL EVALUATION

NAME OF PRINCIPAL APPLICANT: \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL: \_\_\_\_\_

NUMERICAL RATING:              Excellent – 4              Good – 3              Fair – 2              Questionable – 1

### 1) EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH PROPOSAL

#### a) Detailed Evaluation

#### Numerical Rating

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| 1. Clarity and focus of objectives.....  | _____ |
| 2. Description and details of experimental methodology.....  | _____ |
| 3. Scientific content of proposal; adequacy and validity of approach .....   | _____ |
| 4. Feasibility of proposed research, both scientifically and in terms<br>of the equipment, research personnel and time frame ..... | _____ |
| 5. Originality/novelty of proposed research .....  | _____ |
| 6. Probability that the stated objectives will be achieved.....  | _____ |

#### b) Overall Evaluation: Check one box only.

- ( ) Excellent:      A first-class project strongly promising significant advances; would compare favorably with other international work being done in the same or a related field.
- ( ) Good:          A well-covered project but with less originality and potential for advancing its area of science than “excellent.”
- ( ) Fair:            A useful contribution to the field.
- ( ) Questionable:    Of marginal scientific value.

### 2) EVALUATION OF THE APPLICANTS

#### Detailed Evaluation of Individual Applicant or Group Members

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| 1. Knowledge of, and experience in, the proposed area of research.....     | _____ |
| 2. Past productivity (recent publication record) .....                     | _____ |
| 3. Significance of previous contributions in this area of research.....    | _____ |
| 4. Competence to carry out proposed research program.....                  | _____ |
| 5. Group integration, cohesiveness and collaboration (if appropriate)..... | _____ |

3) RELEVANCE OF THE PROPOSED RESEARCH TO THE COMMISSION'S PROGRAM OF GREAT LAKES FISHERY REHABILITATION AND SEA LAMPREY CONTROL

Overall Evaluation of Relevance: Check one box only.

- ( ) Excellent: Considerable relevance to the Commission with a strong probability of socio-economic returns.
- ( ) Good: Useful work which addresses a Commission concern and which might lead to socio-economic returns.
- ( ) Fair: Marginally related to an area of Commission concern and not likely to lead to socio-economic returns.
- ( ) Questionable: Relevance and socio-economic benefits doubtful.
- ( ) 0: Outside the terms of reference of the program.

4) BUDGET RATING: Underestimated (-)      Appropriate (x)      Overestimated (+)

Assistants ( )      Equipment ( )      Travel ( )      Materials ( )      Computing Costs ( )      Total ( )

---

5) DETAILED COMMENTS

Please explain the basis for the evaluation given. The strengths and weaknesses of the proposal should be discussed, with specific comments on the background of the investigators in relation to the current application. Comments are also requested on the potential relevance and socio-economic benefits of the results of the research program.

This review will be considered by the Commission's Board of Technical Experts, and you should indicate if anonymity is wanted. If you do not require anonymity, you may sign below. The Board expresses its appreciation for your help.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

Please return by: \_\_\_\_\_