

Standard Worksheet

ES - Peer Review System - Microsoft Internet Explorer

File View Favorites Tools Help

Address: https://localhost/reviewPrep.do?definition=success

The Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service

Peer Review System

CSREES
USDA
CONSERVATION • EDUCATION

[Reviewer Home](#) | [Home](#) | [Questionnaire](#) | [Change Password](#) | [User Guide](#) | [Confidentiality](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Log Out](#)

Reviewer Worksheet

Usage tips: To avoid possible data loss, please use word processing software to compose and save the text of your review, then copy and paste it into the review textbox.

OMB NO.: 0524-0041

Also, please proofread your review carefully on the verification page as some formatting and special characters may not be preserved.

EXPIRATION DATE: 06/30/2006

Review Form for The PRRSv-Macrophage Molecular Dialogue, CSREES

Grant Application #: 2005-01552 Institution: University of Minnesota Project Director: Mark Rutherford

[Conflict of Interest](#)

Review:

test

Maximum length 10,000 words

Score:

☒ Excellent
☐ Very Good
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor

[Save For Later](#) [Continue](#)

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0524-0041. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 5 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.

|| be timed out in 00:58:25 unless there is some activity.

Expertise Worksheet

ES - Peer Review System - Microsoft Internet Explorer

File View Favorites Tools Help

Address bar: https://localhost/conflictAction.do

Search Favorites

CSREES
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service
USDA

Peer Review System

Reviewer Home | Home | Questionnaire | Change Password | User Guide | Confidentiality | Contact Us | Log Out

Reviewer Worksheet

Usage tips:
To avoid possible data loss, please use word processing software to compose and save the text of your review, then copy and paste it into the review textbox.
Also, please proofread your review carefully on the verification page as some formatting and special characters may not be preserved.

OMB NO.: 0524-0041
EXPIRATION DATE: 06/30/2006

Review Form for Marek's Disease Virus Latency and Reactivation: Identifying Targets for Controlling Horizontal Transmission, CSREES

Grant Application #: 2005-01556 Institution: University of Delaware Project Director: Mark Parcels

[Conflict of Interest](#)

CRITERION	EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION
A. Potential for Advancing Quality of Education; Advancing Areas of National Need. This criterion is used to assess the likelihood that the proposed program of undergraduate or graduate study will result in the development of outstanding graduates to meet the future needs of a globally interconnected, technologically advanced, rapidly diversifying and consumer driven food and agricultural industry. Elements include: quality of the chosen academic program, current and future demand for graduates in chosen discipline(s), strength of the curriculum, instructional approaches, strategies for developing critical thinking and problem solving skills and prior success in or potential for graduating Fellows/Scholars	Acceptable?: Yes <input type="radio"/> Marginal <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Comments: <div></div> <div>Maximum length 2,000 characters</div>	If you choose FUND AS SUBMITTED, then the points for this section should be within the range of 26-30. If you choose FUND WITH MINOR REVISIONS, then the points for this section should be within the range of 18-25. If you choose DO NOT FUND, then the points for this section should be 0-17. Points A <input type="text"/>
B. Proposed Approach. (a) Recruitment and selection: The applicant's strategies and procedures for identifying and recruiting outstanding students who are committed to careers in food and agricultural sciences and who will increase the multicultural diversity of the workforce. (b) Academic advising, career counseling, mentoring, and student support services: The applicant's plans and procedures for assessing, monitoring, guiding, and	Acceptable?: Yes <input type="radio"/> Marginal <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Comments: <div></div>	If you choose FUND AS SUBMITTED, then the points for this section should be within the range of 21-25. If you choose FUND WITH MINOR REVISIONS, then the points for this section should be within the range of 15-20. If you choose DO NOT

Will be timed out in 00:59:43 unless there is some activity.

B. Proposed Approach.

(a) Recruitment and selection: The applicant's strategies and procedures for identifying and recruiting outstanding students who are committed to careers in food and agricultural sciences and who will increase the multicultural diversity of the workforce.

(b) Academic advising, career counseling, mentoring, and student support services: The applicant's plans and procedures for assessing, monitoring, guiding, and sustaining a Scholar's/Fellow's continued commitment and progress toward securing an education in preparation for a career in the food and agricultural sciences, and for providing appropriate career counseling, mentoring, and support services to Scholars/Fellows.

(c) Program evaluation and dissemination: The adequacy and reasonableness of the applicant's plans, as reflected in the grant application, for

- (1) evaluating project management and effectiveness,
- (2) tracking Scholars/Fellows' accomplishments after graduation, and
- (3) disseminating project outcomes and achievements to a wide audience of educators and policy makers, in order to expand the pipeline of outstanding students interested in careers in food and agricultural sciences.

Acceptable?:

Yes ☐ Marginal ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Maximum length 2,000 characters

If you choose FUND AS SUBMITTED, then the points for this section should be within the range of 21-25.

If you choose FUND WITH MINOR REVISIONS, then the points for this section should be within the range of 15-20.

If you choose DO NOT FUND, then the points for this section should be 0-14.

Points B

C. Institutional Commitment and Resources.

The degree to which the grant application substantiates clearly: (1) that the facilities and equipment, instructional support resources and other academic attributes are excellent for providing outstanding teaching and research at the forefront of science and technology related to the chosen discipline; and (2) the commitment to support the Scholars/Fellows education and research over and beyond the funds provided by USDA.

Acceptable?:

Yes ☐ Marginal ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Maximum length 2,000 characters

If you choose FUND AS SUBMITTED, then the points for this section should be within the range of 17-20.

If you choose FUND WITH MINOR REVISIONS, then the points for this section should be within the range of 12-16.

If you choose DO NOT FUND, then the points for this section should be 0-11.

Points C

D. Key Personnel.

The qualifications and roles of key staff assigned to the project, particularly the project director and faculty or staff having the most frequent or influential contacts with Scholars / Fellows. Elements include such attributes as competence and/or experience in research, teaching, community service, working with diverse cultural groups, students at risk of not completing their degree programs, and leading similar projects.

Acceptable?:

Yes ☐ Marginal ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Maximum length 2,000 characters

If you choose FUND AS SUBMITTED, then the points for this section should be within the range of 13-15.

If you choose FUND WITH MINOR REVISIONS, then the points for this section should be within the range of 9-12.

If you choose DO NOT FUND, then the points for this section should be 0-8.

Points D

E. Innovation.

The degree to which the grant application describes any innovative, special features of the academic program(s) that will be available especially to Scholars/Fellows or required as a part of their degree program(s), including: an interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, or cross-disciplinary approach; a focus on innovative, multi-disciplinary education programs, material, or curricula; a multi-university collaborative approach; an emphasis on a collateral specialization or minor in a related discipline; research opportunities, internships, practicum, experiential learning opportunities, international research/educational experiences, and related work experiences.

Acceptable?:

Yes ☐ Marginal ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Maximum length 2,000 characters

If you choose FUND AS SUBMITTED, then the points for this section should be within the range of 9-10.

If you choose FUND WITH MINOR REVISIONS, then the points for this section should be within the range of 6-8.

If you choose DO NOT FUND, then the points for this section should be 0-5.

Points E

Total Points

Fund as Submitted (F)

☐

Fund with Minor Revisions (R)
(see comments above)

☐

Do Not Fund (N)

☐

Detailed Justification: Explain your decision if you choose "Do Not Fund."

E. Innovation.
The degree to which the grant application describes any innovative, special features of the academic program(s) that will be available especially to Scholars/Fellows or required as a part of their degree program(s), including: an interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, or cross-disciplinary approach; a focus on innovative, multi-disciplinary education programs, material, or curricula; a multi-university collaborative approach; an emphasis on a collateral specialization or minor in a related discipline; research opportunities, internships, practicum, experiential learning opportunities, international research/educational experiences, and related work experiences.

Acceptable?:
Yes ☐ Marginal ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Maximum length 2,000 characters

8.

Points D

If you choose FUND AS SUBMITTED, then the points for this section should be within the range of 9-10.

If you choose FUND WITH MINOR REVISIONS, then the points for this section should be within the range of 6-8.

If you choose DO NOT FUND, then the points for this section should be 0-5.

Points E

Total Points

Fund as Submitted (F)
☐

Fund with Minor Revisions (R)
(see comments above) ☐

Do Not Fund (N)
☐
Detailed Justification: Explain your decision if you choose "Do Not Fund."

Maximum length 2,000 characters

[Save For Later](#) [Continue](#)

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0524-0041. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 5 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.

Institutional Worksheet

ES - Peer Review System - Microsoft Internet Explorer

File View Favorites Tools Help

Search Favorites

https://localhost/conflictAction.do

The Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service

Peer Review System

Reviewer Home | Home | Questionnaire | Change Password | User Guide | Confidentiality | Contact Us | Log Out

Reviewer Worksheet

To avoid possible data loss, please use word processing software to compose and save the text of your review, then copy and paste it into the review textbox.

Usage tips:

Also, please proofread your review carefully on the verification page as some formatting and special characters may not be preserved.

OMB NO.: 0524-0041

EXPIRATION DATE: 06/30/2006

Review Form for Marek's Disease Virus Latency and Reactivation: Identifying Targets for Controlling Horizontal Transmission, CSREES

Grant Application #: 2005-01556

Institution: University of Delaware

Project Director: Mark Parcels

[Conflict of Interest](#)

CRITERION	EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION
A. Potential for Advancing Quality of Education; Significance of the Problem. This criterion is used to assess the likelihood that the project will have an impact upon and advance the quality of food and agricultural sciences by strengthening institutional capacities to meet clearly delineated needs. Elements considered include institutional long-range goals, identification of a problem or opportunity to be addressed, justification for the project, innovation, advancing educational equity, multidisciplinary and/or problem-based focus, and potential for adoption by other institutions.	Acceptable?: Yes <input type="radio"/> Marginal <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Comments: <div></div> <div>Maximum length 2,000 characters</div>	<div>If you choose FUND AS SUBMITTED, then the points for this section should be within the range of 26-30.</div> <div>If you choose FUND WITH MINOR REVISIONS, then the points for this section should be within the range of 18-25.</div> <div>If you choose DO NOT FUND, then the points for this section should be 0-17.</div> <div>Points A <input type="text"/></div>
B. Proposed Approach and Cooperative Linkages. This criterion relates to the soundness of the proposed approach including objectives, methodology, plan of operation, timetable, expected products and results, evaluation, and dissemination plans. Emphasis is placed on the quality of educational or research support provided to the applicant institution through its partnerships and collaborative initiatives, and on the potential cooperative linkages likely to evolve as a	Acceptable?: Yes <input type="radio"/> Marginal <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Comments: <div></div>	<div>If you choose FUND AS SUBMITTED, then the points for this section should be within the range of 21-25.</div> <div>If you choose FUND WITH MINOR REVISIONS, then the points for this section should be within the range of 15-20.</div> <div>If you choose DO NOT</div>

If you choose DO NOT FUND, then the points for this section should be 0-8.

D. Key Personnel.

This criterion relates to the adequacy of the number and qualifications of key persons who will develop and carry out the project, and the qualifications of project personnel who will provide for the assessment of project results and impacts and dissemination of these findings.

Acceptable?:

Yes ☐ Marginal ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Maximum length 2,000 characters

If you choose FUND AS SUBMITTED, then the points for this section should be within the range of 13-15.

If you choose FUND WITH MINOR REVISIONS, then the points for this section should be within the range of 9-12.

If you choose DO NOT FUND, then the points for this section should be 0-8.

Points D

E. Budget and Cost-Effectiveness.

This criterion relates to the extent to which the total budget adequately supports the project and is cost effective. Elements considered include the necessity and reasonableness of costs to carry out project activities and achieve project objectives; the appropriateness of budget allocations between the applicant and any collaborating institution(s); the adequacy of time committed to the project by key project personnel; and the degree to which the project maximizes the use of limited resources, optimizes educational value for the dollar, achieves economies of scale, leverages additional funds, and focuses expertise and activity on high-priority educational or research need areas.

Acceptable?:

Yes ☐ Marginal ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Maximum length 2,000 characters

If you choose FUND AS SUBMITTED, then the points for this section should be within the range of 9-10.

If you choose FUND WITH MINOR REVISIONS, then the points for this section should be within the range of 6-8.

If you choose DO NOT FUND, then the points for this section should be 0-5.

Points E

Total Points

Fund as Submitted (F)

☐

Fund with Minor Revisions (R)
(see comments above) ☐

Do Not Fund (N)

☐

Detailed Justification: Explain your decision if you choose "Do Not Fund."

E. Budget and Cost-Effectiveness.
 This criterion relates to the extent to which the total budget adequately supports the project and is cost effective. Elements considered include the necessity and reasonableness of costs to carry out project activities and achieve project objectives; the appropriateness of budget allocations between the applicant and any collaborating institution(s); the adequacy of time committed to the project by key project personnel; and the degree to which the project maximizes the use of limited resources, optimizes educational value for the dollar, achieves economies of scale, leverages additional funds, and focuses expertise and activity on high-priority educational or research need areas.

Acceptable?:
 Yes ☐ Marginal ☐ No ☐

Comments:

Maximum length 2,000 characters

Points D

If you choose FUND AS SUBMITTED, then the points for this section should be within the range of 9-10.

If you choose FUND WITH MINOR REVISIONS, then the points for this section should be within the range of 6-8.

If you choose DO NOT FUND, then the points for this section should be 0-5.

Points E

Total Points

Fund as Submitted (F)
☐

Fund with Minor Revisions (R)
 (see comments above) ☐

Do Not Fund (N)
☐
 Detailed Justification: Explain your decision if you choose "Do Not Fund."

Maximum length 2,000 characters

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0524-0041. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 5 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.