*Please read the attached “external reviewer” document to evaluate external reviewers’ feedback. Please also read the “call for applications” document to understand what each applicant was being asked to assemble. It would be greatly appreciated if these reviews could be returned by* ***June 28, 2014****. Please email your reviews to* [*ndsu.forward@ndsu.edu*](mailto:ndsu.forward@ndsu.edu)*.*

**APPLICANT:** **TOTAL SCORE:       RANK:**

**Scoring Instructions**:

Each committee member, please provide a score for each criterion based on the specified maximum score. Total scores of less than 70 will likely not be funded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Score** |
| **(1) Priority status:** Priority will be given to Assistant Professors who have recently received a third year review. Associate Professors will be given priority status if two years past their promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and have at least two years before they intend to apply for promotion to Professor. Priority will also be given to those who were hired at Associate Professor rank and have at least two years before they intend to apply for promotion to Professor. Associate Professors who previously received a Leap Grant at the Assistant Professor rank are eligible to apply, but will not fall into the priority category.  **10 points if meets priority status** |  |
| **(2) Statement of purpose and potential for positive impact:**   * Is the statement of purpose clear and convincing that the applicant(s) has a need for this lab renovation grant to help them become competitive for other grants? Are future funding plans clearly described and convincing? * Do the grants and proposals listed with the CV reflect a need for improved infrastructure?   Deduct points if the applicant is clearly already successful at obtaining funding external to NDSU. **Maximum 30 points** |  |
| **(3) Evaluation of the external reviewers’ feedback:** Average the total scores provided by the external reviewers. This score may be adjusted if there is disparity between the external reviewers. If adjusted, please indicate why and how. **Maximum 50 points** |  |
| **(4) Soundness of the budget justification:** Does the budget seem reasonable? Are the estimated costs clearly described and justified? **Maximum 5 points** |  |
| **(5) Overall quality of the application:** Does the application follow the instructions for application formatting provided in the *“call for applications”* document? Is this a professionally written proposal, free of spelling and grammatical errors?  **Maximum 5 points** |  |
| **TOTAL SCORE** |  |

Please provide a summary statement with comments for the PI. Your comments should be constructive and evaluative. A summary of all internal review committee member comments’ will be compiled to return to each applicant.