

Cooperative Research Proposal Evaluation Criteria from prior years

This is a list of scoring and evaluation criteria that were used in prior cooperative research annual competitions. This is information to be used by the New England Fishery Management Council for their funding efforts in 2015-2015.

NCRPP evaluation criteria from BAA 2005 (Types I & II proposals)

E. PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: Proposals will be reviewed by a panel of experts consisting of marine scientist, fishery managers, and representatives from the fishing industry. A score of 0 to 10 (10 being the highest achievable score) will be assigned to each factor listed below.

I. Research Value:

Type 1: To what degree does the proposal:

- improve the information available for groundfish management under the proposed Amendment 13?
- address specific groundfish gear selectivity on both recovered and recovering groundfish species?
- contribute to a long-term strategy to rebuild and sustain stocks?
- clearly state the time period and specific areas for the conduct of this research and other factors such as species, fisheries, i.e., gear sectors, time of year, and other important information to be addressed in the study?
- clearly describe how the project will achieve its stated objectives?
- offer practical solutions to management concerns relevant to the priorities described above?
- describe clearly the applicants facilities, equipment, and infrastructure proposed for this project listed?

Type 2: To what degree does the proposal:

- clearly articulate the specific research question or hypothesis to be studied as listed above in section C. (1): Type 2, i.e., regulatory, monitoring, enforcement, social and economic factors relevant to the development of SAP programs or the use of “B” DAS?
- state the specific research target population, research methods, study design, study instrument, measurement scales, and analytical procedures?
- offer practical applied research that may result in potential solutions that dovetail well with current management challenges?
- list all facilities, equipment, and infrastructure needed to accomplish the project?

II. Collaborative value for both types: To what degree does the proposal:

- promote collaboration between fishermen and scientists?
- involve a strong research partnership that is highly likely to succeed?
- involve a high degree of pro-active participation by fishermen in the design and conduct

- of research?
- address fishermen's interests or concerns?

NCRPP Proposal Score Sheet FY 2006

Proposal # _____
 Evaluator Name _____

Proposal Name: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Directions: Review the proposal and give each factor below a score using the scale provided. *A point value must be assigned to all factors regardless of your funding preference.* Please provide written justification for your scores and funding preference in the space provided.

I. Importance, Relevance and Applicability: 25 points

To what degree does the proposal have intrinsic value or relevance to NOAA, Federal, regional, state, or local activities? Researchers should provide a clear definition of the problem, need, issue, or hypothesis to be addressed. The proposal should be relevant to the research priorities and detail how the data gathered from the research will be used to enhance the understanding of the fishery resource or contribute to the body of information on which management decisions are made.

Using the scale below, score this item (lowest score possible 0):	Score
Poor Fair Good Commendable Excellent	
0-----8-----15-----20-----25	

Importance, Relevance and Applicability Justification: Limit your comments to the space provided.

II. Technical or Scientific Merit: 25 points

To what degree is the proposal technically sound or innovative, have appropriate methods and clear project goals and objectives? The approach to be used, including description of fieldwork, theoretical studies, and laboratory analysis to support the proposed research, should be clearly specified

Using the scale below, score this item (lowest score possible 0):	Score
Poor Fair Good Commendable Excellent	
0-----8-----15-----20-----25	

Technical or Scientific Merit: Limit your comments to the space provided.

III. Collaborative Value: 20 points

To what degree does the proposal promote collaboration between fishermen and scientists, including a strong research partnership that is highly likely to succeed and has a high degree of pro-active participation by fishermen in the design and conduct of research?

Using the scale below, score this item (lowest score possible 0):

Poor Fair Good Commendable Excellent

0-----5-----10-----15-----20

Score

Collaborative Value: Limit your comments to the space provided.

--

IV. Project Costs: 20 points

To what degree does the proposal have a cost that is realistic and commensurate with the project needs and time frame? Cost-effectiveness of the project should be considered. Economic and budget projections should be quantified, to the extent possible

Using the scale below, score this item (lowest score possible 0):

Poor Fair Good Commendable Excellent

0-----5-----10-----15-----20

Score

Project Costs: Limit your comments to the space provided.

--

V. Qualifications and Experience of Project Participants: 10 points

To what degree does the proposal demonstrate whether the applicant, and team members, posses the necessary education, experience, training, facilities, and administrative resources to accomplish the project?

Using the scale below, score this item (lowest score possible 0)

Poor Fair Good Commendable Excellent

A horizontal number line with dashed lines. It has tick marks at 0, 4, 6, 8, and 10. The numbers are written below the line.

Score

Qualifications and Experience of Project Participants: Limit your comments to the space provided.

--

TOTAL SCORE (Maximum of 100)	
-------------------------------------	--

VI. Funding Preference: Check the appropriate box and provide justification in the space provided.

FUND

_____ DO NOT FUND

UNDECIDED

--

2009 BAA criteria

1. Importance, relevance and applicability of the proposed project: This criterion ascertains whether there is intrinsic value in the proposed work or relevance to NOAA, Federal, regional, state, or local activities. Researchers should provide a clear definition of the problem, need, issue, or hypothesis to be addressed. Specific reference to a fishery management plan or research topic listed above is highly recommended. The proposal should describe its relevance to the research priorities and detail how the data gathered from the research will be used to enhance the understanding of the fishery resource or contribute to the body of information on which management decisions are made. (25 points)

2. Technical or scientific merit: This criterion assesses whether the approach is technically sound or innovative, if the methods are appropriate, and whether there are clear project goals and objectives. The approach to be used, including description of fieldwork, theoretical studies, and laboratory analysis to support the proposed research, should be clearly specified. (25 points)

3. Collaborative value: This criterion assesses whether the research promotes collaboration between fishermen and scientists, including a strong research partnership that is highly likely to succeed and has a high degree of pro-active participation by fishermen in the design and conduct of research. (20 points)

4. **Project costs:** This criterion evaluates the cost or price to determine if it is realistic and commensurate with the project needs and time frame. Cost-effectiveness of the project will be considered. Economic and budget projections should be quantified, to the extent possible. All proposals will be evaluated in terms of cost sharing and overhead rates. (20 points)

5. Qualifications and experience of project participants: This criterion assesses whether the applicant, and team members, posses the necessary education, experience, training, facilities, and administrative resources to accomplish the project. (5 points)

6. Past Performance: The past performance of Offerors who have previously been awarded research contracts or grants shall be considered for determining awards under this announcement. (5 points)