|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| New Jersey Department of Transportation - Bureau of Research | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|
| **Proposal Evaluation Form (Step 1A)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| The following form is to evaluate proposals. For each of the categories listed, assign the following points based on the review of the proposal (fill gray areas) and justification for each category is mandatory. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Rating: Excellent = 4; Above Average = 3; Average = 2; Below Average =1; Not Covered = 0* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposal Number:**  **Name of the Reviewer: Reviewer Signature:** | | |  | | | | |  | |  | | | | | | | |
| **Proposal Review** | | | **Rating** | | | | | **Weight** | | **Score** | | | | | | | |
| **1. UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROPOSAL** | | |  | | | | |  | |  | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Does the proposal presents clear understanding of the problem statement? | | |  | | | | | 3.0 | |  | | | | | | | |
|  | | |  | | | | |  | |  | | | | | | | |
| **2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH** | | |  | | | | |  | |  | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Is the research methodology adequately described? | | |  | | | | | 3.5 | |  | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 Does the proposed tasks effectively address all the objectives listed in the RFP? | | |  | | | | | 4.0 | |  | | | | | | | |
| 2.3 Does the proposal follow effective research principles to generate valid results? | | |  | | | | | 2.5 | |  | | | | | | | |
|  | | |  | | | | |  | |  | | | | | | | |
| **3. TASKS, DELIVERABLES, AND SCHEDULE** | | |  | | | | |  | |  | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Are task descriptions complete and are interim task deliverables appropriate? | | |  | | | | | 2.0 | |  | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 Are the task durations and overall project duration reasonable for the work proposed? | | |  | | | | | 1.5 | |  | | | | | | | |
|  | | |  | | | | |  | |  | | | | | | | |
| **4. INNOVATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF RESULTS** | | |  | | | | |  | |  | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 Does the proposal give an overview of relevant literature? | | |  | | | | | 1.0 | |  | | | | | | | |
| 4.2 Are there any innovative ideas, techniques, materials contained in the proposal? Implementation plan | | |  | | | | | 1.5 | |  | | | | | | | |
| 4.3 Does the proposal suggest a suitable implementation plan? | | |  | | | | | 1.0 | |  | | | | | | | |
|  | | |  | | | | |  | |  | | | | | | | |
| **SCORE FOR THIS PROPOSAL** | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **MAXIMUM SCORE** | | | **80.0** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Note:** Although the scores are not released to universities, your comments and feedback can help improving future proposals as well as during the Debriefing. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| New Jersey Department of Transportation - Bureau of Research  **Justification for Evaluation Form (Step 1B)**   1. **Understanding of the Proposal:** 2. **Research Methodology and Approach:** 3. **Tasks, Deliverables, and Schedule:** 4. **Innovation and Implementation of Results:**   **Strengths:** *What did you like best in the proposal?*  **Aspects that could be improved:** *What was unclear, missing or confusing?* | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| New Jersey Department of Transportation- Bureau of Research | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|
| **PI Performance Evaluation Form (Step 1C)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
| The following form is used by the Bureau of Research to evaluate the PI’s performance. For each of the categories listed assign the following points based on the presentation. (Fill gray areas)  *Rating: Excellent = 4; Above Average = 3; Average = 2; Below Average =1; Not Covered = 0* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposal Number:**  **Research team /University:**  **Name of the Reviewer: Reviewer Signature:** | | | |  | | | | | | |  | | |  | | | |
| **Proposal Review** | **Rating** | | | | | | | | | | | **Weight** | | | **Score** | | |
| **1. THE EXPERIENCE, QUALIFICATION AND AVAILABILITY OF THE RESEARCH TEAM** |  | | | | | | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
| 1.1 Is the research team's background and experience relevant to the project? |  | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | |  | | |
| 1.2 Availability/Other Commitments of research Team |  | | | | | | | | | | | 1.5 | | |  | | |
| 1.3 Principal Investigator Past Performance on NJDOT projects |  | | | | | | | | | | | 1.5 | | |  | | |
| **SCORE FOR THIS PROPOSAL** |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | |
| **MAXIMUM SCORE** | **20.0** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Note:** Although the scores are not released to universities, your comments and feedback can help to improve future proposals. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
| New Jersey Department of Transportation- Bureau of Research | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|
| **Proposal** **Oral Presentation Evaluation Form (Step 2) (Optional)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |  | |  | | | | | |
| The following form is used to evaluate the proposals through oral presentations. For each of the categories listed assign the following points based on the presentation. (Fill gray areas)  *Rating: Excellent = 4; Above Average = 3; Average = 2; Below Average =1; Not Covered = 0* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposal Number:**  **Research team /University:**  **Name of the Reviewer: Reviewer Signature:** | | | | |  | | | | | | | |  | | |  |
| **Proposal Review** | | **Rating** | | | | | | | **Weight** | | | | | |
| **ORAL PRESENTATION** | |  | | | | | | |  | | | | | |
| 1. Effectiveness of the presentation for better understanding the submitted proposal | |  | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | |
| 2. Research team response to questions/comments | |  | | | | | | | 1.5 | | | | | |
| 3. Overall confidence in research team | |  | | | | | | | 1.5 | | | | | |
|  | |  | | | | | | |  | | | | | |
| **SCORE FOR THIS PROPOSAL** | | **20.0** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **MAXIMUM SCORE** | | **Rating** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Note:** Although the scores are not released to universities, your comments and feedback can help to improve future proposals.  Strengths: What did you like best in the presentation?  Aspects that could be improved: What was unclear, missing or confusing? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |