

APPENDIX C: FY 2006 MERIT REVIEW AND PEER EVALUATION MEETING: FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDATIONS

These notes summarize the comments received from various participants at the May 15-19, 2006 Review:

- Section 1:** Comments received from Peer Reviewers during feedback sessions held immediately after each subprogram track was completed. The comments received were generally focused on the basic review process; however, where relevant, notes specific to a particular subprogram session are included.
- Section 2:** Scores and summarized answers to questions from the Review Questionnaire, filled out by approximately 124 of the participants.

Section 1 – Peer Reviewer Comments

General Review Comments

- Overall, the review seemed smoother than last year.
- This week in May is difficult for university attendees. It's so close to final exams and graduation; scheduling the review a week or two later would be helpful.
- The location was very convenient – close to the airport and subway.
- There were too many people in the corridors. It was difficult to move around during the breaks and it got loud outside when the sessions were still going. Suggestion: Move the food tables farther away from the session room doors.
- The security at the Reagan Center served as a choke point. Suggestion: Consider having it at a 'non-secure' place next year.
- Many do not listen to the lunch presentations. The program is too packed and doesn't allow time for 'processing' data or reacting to what's shown.
- The food was really good this year.
- No fees! Keep it free.
- Plenary Session
 - Safety didn't come across in the Plenary Session or any of the lunch presentations. There are some great things happening in Safety. Awareness needs to be raised; safety is important to pay for along the line.
 - The session was useful.
 - Liked how the session linked together the different areas of the Program.
 - Disliked that there was not enough time for more technical detail.
 - Suggestion: Cover other U.S. agencies in a similar manner.

Review Forms

- Concerns about Review Format: Bulleting comments and forcing the separation of strengths and weaknesses tends to oversimplify the thoughts behind the comments and constrains the potential depth of feedback. (The current format makes it difficult to incorporate qualifiers, i.e. "The project is effective, but...").
- On the first page of the form, consider putting the ranking and numbers on the top to allow notes and comments to stretch all the way down and across the page. The 'comments' boxes do not allow enough space to write.
- Formatting: Bullets don't pop up automatically in Excel spreadsheet.

- Instructions for completing the reviewer form could be improved.
- What is the purpose of the “relevance” question? If the Program is funding the project hasn’t that determination already been made?
- A separate “Center Evaluation Form” would be useful in evaluating the centers. Would be able to give better feedback on the centers this way.

Poster Presentations

- Liked that there was more room this year, but it was still difficult to get around people at times.
- Felt that posters, in general, are difficult to review. There is not equal input; reviewers may not all hear the same thing from the PI.
- Suggestion: Limit the number of posters to be reviewed in a session to four per reviewer. This would give each reviewer at least 30 minutes for each poster. Otherwise, there is not enough time to thoroughly review the posters.
- Suggestion: Break up the different research areas (e.g., not have all of the Storage posters on the same night). This would be a way to give fewer posters to each reviewer in a given night.
- Poster Session at Reagan Center: The location away from the hotel presented logistical problems. Many of the hotel sessions didn’t let out until 6:00 pm or later, and the security checks at the Reagan Center took too long. It might be better to have the reception in a “non-secure” building or stay in the hotel next year.
- Consider creating more of a break between the oral presentations and the poster sessions. There needs to be more time to relax. Suggestion: Start the poster sessions later.

Fuel Cell Review Session

Technical Progress

- Synergies Among Projects: The national labs tend to coordinate better than industry. With solicitations this year, it will become even more integrated.
- Advanced polymer electrolyte membranes need additional emphasis
- News of new polymer materials seemed to focus on only one research group. This is not the “only show in town,” (e.g., Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is developing a new class of polymers with excellent properties).

Oral Presentations

- Having the presentations online ahead of time was a huge help. It allowed for better comment and helped reviewers ask better questions.
- The session moderators were assertive; they kept the presenters on time which provided more time for discussion.
- The technical discussions were much better this year. Because of the longer time allowance, the PIs had more time to present their work. Reviewers liked the longer format as well; better questions arose. Moving more of the ‘required’ slides to the ‘optional’ section allowed for a more substantive dialogue.
- In general, the sessions are timed too close together, not allowing the reviewer to “process” or react to the information presented.
- Only the first row of tables had access to power strips. It would be nice to have power strips in the second and third rows and around the room. Until laptops are powered by fuel cells, we need more power. Suggestion: More power strips toward the back.
- More comfortable chairs? We’re sitting for a long time.

Systems Analysis Review Session

R&D Portfolio Balance

- A decision-making framework based on the modeling results would be appropriate and a structure for how the Analysis Subprogram supports the overall decision-making of the Hydrogen Program (i.e., which would be a better bang for the R&D buck: higher hydrogen purity in production, or fuel cells and membranes with greater tolerance for impurities?).
- The overarching macro model that will coordinate all the other models and research area is needed.
- Energy security has not been assessed in the portfolio.

Technical Progress

- The international drivers have not been addressed.
- The effect of limited hydrogen production sources for a geographic location should be addressed.
- Analysis of the effect of reductions in the cost of gasoline have on hydrogen competitiveness should be included. Forecasts of gasoline prices and natural gas prices need to be included in the online Hydrogen Analysis Resource Center.
- It is unlikely that hydrogen can ever compete on cost. It should be stated as an assumption of the program, or demonstrated in modeling, that H₂ incentives or a constraint on carbon is the only way hydrogen can be competitive.
- Comparing the Hydrogen Program with other EERE programs, analysis of how hydrogen compares to alternative fuels and competing vehicle types, in both cost and emissions, should probably be a task performed centrally by EERE, not within the Hydrogen Program.
- We lack something larger that looks at models and systems in a larger way, including impact of the world economy on the U.S.
- Analysis Strength Areas:
 - Even though there is some overlap, having two models focused on the same question can be good to confirm the models are good – if they produce the same answers as outputs.
- Analysis Weakness Areas:
 - At times, more last year than now, there has been a lack of coordination and too much overlap among projects. Some people are doing modeling for the sake of modeling, and some projects seem to be doing exactly what has already been done.
 - The demand curve is the weakness of all the analyses; infrastructure is forced into the models rather than being a result.
 - Better input and buy-in are needed from automakers on the percentage of hydrogen fueling stations needed in the market.
 - Everything should produce results in \$/gge for comparison purposes.

Oral Presentations

- The Team Lead's presentation should feed into a description of which models are going to be used for which decisions and provide information about the creation of a cross-cutting team.
- Analysis project presentations need a structure that requires them to include a summary of their inputs and assumptions, so that reviewers can follow where the model is coming from. Suggestion: Perhaps a one- or two-page summary of the assumptions for every model can be provided.
- Presenters were not able to show live demonstrations of a model. Perhaps this could be made available at some other time of the day, possibly during the poster session. This should at least be made available to the reviewers, if not to other attendees. It would allow reviewers to more easily ask questions or better questions.

- Would like to see more preliminary or illustrative results, to give an idea of what the outcomes will be and how the results will be used.

Storage Review Session

Technical Progress

- Concerned that there seems to be much more basic research. There is not so much emphasis on equipment, engineering/applied research, etc. EERE seems to be moving more toward BES-type research. It is agreed, however, that we need to understand materials and be able to narrow material options down before building a system.
- Question of whether materials will make it. The new materials are improvements, but they also have problems. Tremendous progress has been made from a scientific standpoint, but there is strong doubt that the 2010 targets will be met by 2010.

Oral Presentations

- Observation: There were mistakes between DOE technical targets and system material targets in the presentations. Some way to clarify that these are different and distinguish between the two might be useful.
- The safety aspect, particularly regarding new materials, is lacking. Will these new materials be something that can go safely and realistically in a car? Suggestion: Requiring a safety slide would be helpful.
- Centers of Excellence
 - Would like to see how the different groups within each Center are working together. Suggestion: A 40-minute presentation focused on the Center, a description of the groups working in that Center, and how the groups are working together would be extremely helpful.
 - Although not very realistic because the Centers are being reviewed for their progress, would like to hear the Centers' frank evaluation of how they believe they are doing.
 - Suggestion: If possible, group the presentations according to the different areas in each Center.

Safety Codes & Standards Review Session

Technical Progress

- How do the projects in the Safety Codes & Standards subprogram make their way into informing the actual Standards? Sandia has done a great job, but in some cases there is not a connection.

Oral Presentations

- DOE objectives are in project presentations, but the reviewer has no way of knowing if DOE and project objectives are aligned. If they're not aligned, it is important to explain why. Suggestion: Provide the DOE objectives for the project ahead of time.
- Presenters speak about the work they've done, but it is not always clear that the projects are making progress toward the physical objectives. There is not always a way to measure progress.
- Suggestion: Have a stronger connection between the objectives and accomplishments from previous years – possibly require the PIs to present their project's history in beginning of the presentation, as well as explain why focus, mission, or goals have changed, if applicable?
- There seems to be a wide range in the number of reviews assigned to each reviewer (varying from 5 to 18).

Section 2 – Review Feedback Questionnaire Responses**DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS****1a. What was your role in the review?**

- 21** Peer Reviewer (please answer questions in Sections A. and B.).
21 Presenter of a Project -- Oral or Poster (please answer questions in Sections A. and C.).
0 Presenter of Program Overview (please answer questions in Sections A. and C.).
25 Attendee, neither Reviewer nor Presenter (please answer questions in Section A. only).

1b. What is your affiliation?

- 0** Government agency directly sponsoring the program under review.
20 National/government lab, private-sector or university researcher whose project is under review.
17 In an industry directly involved in the program under review.
6 In an industry with interest in the work under review.
1 Government agency with interest in the work.
8 National/government lab, private-sector or university researcher not being reviewed, but who has an interest in the work.
5 Other (please specify, e.g., consultant, retired employee, public, etc.): Consultant, Univ. Prof.

A. QUESTIONS 2 THROUGH 21 FOR ALL ATTENDEES

2.	Purpose and scope of the Hydrogen Program Review were well defined.	<i>disagree</i>					<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.5	
3.	The plenary presentations were helpful to understanding the direction of the Hydrogen Program.	<i>disagree</i>					<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.4	
4.	Sub-program overviews were helpful to understanding the research objectives (during Plenary and the start of each Sub-program track).	<i>disagree</i>					<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.3	
5.	The quality, breadth, and depth of the following were sufficient to contribute to a well-considered review:	<i>disagree</i>					<i>agree</i>	
	a. Presentations	1	2	3	4	5	4.0	
	b. Question & Answer periods	1	2	3	4	5	4.2	
	c. Answers provided concerning programmatic questions	1	2	3	4	5	4.0	
	d. Answers provided concerning technical questions	1	2	3	4	5	4.0	
6.	Enough time was allocated for presentations.	<i>disagree</i>					<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.4	
7.	Time allowed for the Question & Answer period following the presentations was adequate for a rigorous exchange.	<i>disagree</i>					<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.1	
8.	The questions asked by reviewers were sufficiently rigorous and detailed.	<i>disagree</i>					<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	3.8	
9.	There were no problems with:	<i>disagree</i>					<i>agree</i>	
	Groupings of projects by technical area	1	2	3	4	5	4.4	
	Proprietary data (should not be any at this Review)	1	2	3	4	5	4.3	
	Quantity/level of the information presented	1	2	3	4	5	3.8	

10.	The review was conducted smoothly.	<i>disagree</i> 1 2 3 4 5 4.6	<i>agree</i>
11.	The frequency (once per year) of this formal review process for this Program is: <u>61</u> about right <u>2</u> too frequent <u>0</u> not frequent enough <u>0</u> don't know the frequency of reviews		
12.	Logistics and amenities were satisfactory.	<i>disagree</i> 1 2 3 4 5 4.7	<i>agree</i>
13.	The visual quality of the presentations was adequate. I was able to see all of the presentations I attended.	<i>disagree</i> 1 2 3 4 5 4.2	<i>agree</i>
14.	The audio quality of the presentations was adequate. I was able to hear all the presentations I attended.	<i>disagree</i> 1 2 3 4 5 4.5	<i>agree</i>
15.	The hotel accommodations were satisfactory.	<i>disagree</i> 1 2 3 4 5 4.3	<i>agree</i>
16.	The information about the Review and the hotel accommodations sent to me prior to the Review was adequate.	<i>disagree</i> 1 2 3 4 5 4.3	<i>agree</i>

17. What was the most useful part of the review process?

- The opportunity to meet and talk with others working on Hydrogen issues.
- The different sessions pretty much stayed on schedule.
- The technical presentation.
- The information on the results of investigation.
- A quick review of many projects.
- The most important part of the review process was to determine how relevant the approach of the project is towards the present problem. Research progress is also very useful.
- Seeing the big picture and pace of advancement.
- Getting a concentrated review of the activities supported by DOE in each area. My own area of interest is production -- primarily bio-solar. Unfortunately some projects in the area suffered drastic financial cuts.
- Good overview of technical approaches.
- Being able to meet research colleagues and exchange info outside of formal meetings, new contacts made and new insights gained.
- Presentation of objectives and the results of individual programs. Also, reviewer question and responses.
- Information on new technology.
- Learning what others were doing that could be leveraged.
- The focuses of the program, the scope, the highlights of the progress, and the networking.
- Concentration of all program projects.
- Receiving the papers before the conference gave me enough time to prepare my plans at the conference. The reviewers were trained well. Overall the program managers were very accessible and useful in learning about the program.
- Networking with both center partners and others.

- The presentations were very good, however, more than once the batteries went dead on the laser-pointer during presentations.
- Question and Answer during the oral presentations.
- Informal discussions during the breaks.
- The networking, large crowd and uniformity of format.
- Looking at the breadth of work being funded.
- By using common format for all projects it was much easier to compare and contrast.
- The good overview of activities and new developments theory focus session.
- The presentations by PI's.
- The plenary sessions and the subprogram briefings.
- Learning the progress from other groups, building connections and talking to the program director.
- All presentations were at a very high level.
- Basically keeping the focus because it is easy to get off track and start pursuing fundamental issues.
- General information on other work gives perspective.
- Subprogram presentations and question and answer sessions following were critical to raise the significant issues and how to deal with them.
- Question and answer sessions showed insight into general audience and reviewers concerns.
- The presentation information.
- The presentations.
- Learning what was going on in Hydrogen Production (my area).
- In person contact with PIs to further discuss projects outside of formal review periods.
- Learning about the latest research.
- Technical information.
- Hearing about the work performed by others. Meeting with other researchers and discussing work.
- The review is helpful in refining the direction of our research.
- Having all necessary review info ahead of time.
- The contacts and the Q&A were very effective.
- Presentation and updated information.
- Update on the many useful programs funded by DOE and face-to-face meetings with peers and DOE personnel.
- Having external inputs from foreign industries and suppliers to this market.
- The presentation of program overview and the intention of DOE.
- The overview presented at the beginning of the session was very good. The salient points offered in the presentation and indicate how they impact on the goods of the program.

18. What could have been done better?

- All the people continuing their conversation during the lunch presentation was disconcerting, and it must have been very distracting for presenters.
- People interested in different aspects of the program had a hard time attending all the talks of interest due to timing conflicts. The meeting days were too long, and there was no spare time even at lunch. Also, the poster boards need to be further apart to reduce traffic congestion, and many of the presenters slides were overly busy.
- Audience questions and reviewer questions were sparse and not probing. Maybe if the audience was asked to hold questions, reviewers would have spoken up more.
- More time at breaks and lunch.
- Presentation time could be 20 minutes plus 10 minutes for questions.
- More discussion could be a positive.

- When the project is one of multiple related contracts, it could be useful to understand the broader picture in addition to the specific project. Synchronize clocks between sessions.
- The question period was insufficient for asking meaningful questions to the presenter.
- A map of where each presentation and poster fits in each track area for quicker targeting of sessions and posters.
- Notification: I was requested to review projects 3 weeks before the meeting. Definition metrics: A DOE summing of the project objectives (separate from presentation) would have been helpful.
- The conference needs small group discussion sections on selected and focused topics to allow competing groups to challenge and exchange groups.
- Create a visual matrix that illustrates how many pieces of this DOE venture and all of its components will achieve H2 economy.
- It appears that many program answers were using the same source for data H2. It would have been good to have an open panel questioning session about the model to understand limitations of source data inherent in scenario model for production and dispensing.
- Hotel information and reservation.
- More time per project.
- Continue focusing on critical barriers and their resolution.
- I would recommend that an 8 1/2 x 11 sheet be posted outside each salon and at one location centrally located, so that we can review each days program schedule without having to search in our briefcases.
- With regards to item 11 above there may some advantage to splitting the program review in half so that each project is formally reviewed every other year as required, so that each year the materials are more manageable at half the size.
- More room for people to circulate during breaks.
- We had extreme confusion about how many posters to prepare for our directed project.
- More sessions; that is, there should be more than just 3 concurrent sessions to allow more oral presentations.
- Attendees coming and going -- doors opening and closing were distracting.
- Shorter days: 12 hours of program and having lectures at lunch was far too much. Screen position was too low -- lower part of screen was blocked by reviewers.
- Tables for all -- difficult to take notes in chairs alone; list your programs by day, so that one can easily see what is being presented at any given time.
- More detailed info on projects, but this is difficult to do given large number of projects and time available.
- One of your lobby staff needs training for her position. She was unfriendly, rude, and unhelpful. she even questioned me about my use of the metro card offered for the offsite poster session 5/17. Like I am going to misuse it after spending my time and money to participate in the review session. She would do better as a drill sergeant and not as a conference worker.
- Instruction for poster preparation and specific topics for review. Both need to be more detailed for new comer to the DOE program.
- Too many proprietary talks and materials etc.
- The subprogram overview could have given a better overview to help those in the audience less familiar with the technology. For example, I am involved with reforming, but I was very interested in comparing it to other production methods.
- Possibly open discussion panels for sub-groups rather than doing the plenary session or maybe both.
- The PIs should be asked to do a self-evaluation summary on technical and programmable issues. It would also be advisable to identify failures or difficulties. These presentations tend to be too positive.

- Many presentation slides were much too busy and font too small to be read.
- Going through security at Reagan Center was inconvenient. Have coffee available throughout the sessions.
- Presentations should focus more on results impacting go/no-go milestones.
- No road trip to the Reagan Center for posters.
- More rooms at conference hotel.
- During question period consider having person carrying microphone to questioners carrying two microphones so that questioners can have microphone in hand before trying to speak. Second microphone could be given to questioner, while first question is being asked.
- Instructions on when posters should be displayed could have been better.
- Product and vehicle demonstration! People need to see the product.
- Poster reviewing was hard.
- The storage project was too basic and too much modeling, without any discussions of practical issues related to onboard storage.
- Keep the presentation/presenter focused on goals and targets, work accomplished in the last year, discovery and results, and conclusion.
- Progress of the program itself.

19. Overall, how satisfied are you with the review process? *very*
unsatisfied *very*
satisfied

1 2 3 4 5 **4.4**

20. Would you recommend this review process to others and should it be applied to other DOE programs? 52 *yes* 2 *no*

21. Please provide comments and recommendations on the overall review process.

- There should be at least a nominal fee for attendees, which is waived for the peer reviewers.
- It would be desirable to reduce the number of oral presentations, perhaps by limiting them only to projects that are funded at effort levels in excess of one person year.
- I see no way to avoid a full week for the reviews in the future.
- It's very important for information and coordination in DOE program.
- Overall the review process was good. Except for the timing factor, the rest of the process was satisfactory.
- I missed the Steve Chalk "grand kick - off " presentation -- inspiration is good. Steve helps provide that.
- Too structured control; there is little sense of spontaneity. Presenters are too self-centered with their projects; Center of Excellence presentations are too repetitious and self-serving.
- While the levels of the R & D efforts are high quality, one or two have the potential of achieving the DOE goals.
- Have someone explain relevance of each project and the program itself.
- It was excellent.
- There appear to be too many projects for substantive review and feedback. The reviews actually have little time. As a forum to exchange scientific ideas and give the broad picture to peers, the forum works well.
- Process goes smoothly, but on one level, it reduces a fiscal year of work to progress achieved by mid April (in order to meet slide deadline for merit reviews, which then goes into the program).
- You should convince your colleagues in DOE-FE to do the same for their fuel cell program (not simply seen). Logistically, very well run; only a few moderators allowed speakers to overrun their time.

APPENDIX C: FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- I did not respond to question 20 because same review process may not work for all DOE programs.
- To confirm the registration by email before the meeting.
- I am too new to the process to be able to criticize.
- The PD session moderators did an excellent job of keeping to the schedule and allowing adequate Q & A. They also did a great job of interjecting DOE motivation/priorities when appropriate.
- Recommendation -- split the review into subject matter three days rather than have all the presentations running concurrently.
- Presenters with English as a second language talk too fast.
- The PIs need to better define project relevance to the overall goals. The reviews need more emphasis on progress versus go/no-go milestones.
- Review should probably be in a small setting with more direct interaction/discussion between presenters and reviewers.
- I am very pleased with the reviewing process; feel that it is very effective.
- I did not see copy of the rating system used by the reviewers. I presented an un-reviewed poster. I have found it difficult to describe the work sufficiently in the time available during past oral presentations. Also, I have been frustrated when reviewer questions indicated that reviewers had missed or ignored discussions of issues during the talk. I found the poster presentation gave me an opportunity to discuss issues more completely, but not many people stopped to talk. In the past I felt that some of the review comments indicated bias.
- Group more by common areas, distribute more poster sessions, and check in advance contents of presentations to verify consistency with template.
- Very well organized. Appreciated good attendance of fuel cell TDMs and projectors at fuel cell sessions. Great venue for this meeting; suggest keeping it here next year; meeting rooms were just the right size. Excellent food and service; granola, yogurt and fruit served on Tuesday morning was very much appreciated and missed on following mornings, which had tasty but sugary food. Judi Abraham's help with accommodations is appreciated.
- The poster session needs help. Too many posters; not enough time to see and interface.
- I came from Japan. The open mindedness of DOE in allowing foreigners to attend the meeting is good. To make progress on hydrogen and fuel cell technologies that is useful to the market, cooperation through the world is very important.

B. QUESTIONS 22 THROUGH 33 FOR PEER REVIEWERS ONLY

22.	Information about the program/project(s) under review was provided sufficiently prior to the review session.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>					
		1	2	3	4	5					4.0
23.	Review instructions were provided in a timely manner.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>					
		1	2	3	4	5					4.6
24.	The information provided in the presentations was adequate for a meaningful review of the projects.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>					
		1	2	3	4	5					3.9
25.	The evaluation criteria upon which the review was organized were clearly defined and used appropriately.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>					
	1. <i>Relevance</i>										
	2. <i>Approach</i>	1	2	3	4	5					4.2
	3. <i>Technical Accomplishments and Progress</i>	1	2	3	4	5					4.4
	4. <i>Technology Transfer/Collaboration</i>	1	2	3	4	5					4.3
	5. <i>Proposed Future Research</i>	1	2	3	4	5					4.1
		1	2	3	4	5					4.4

26.	Explanation of the questions within the criteria was clear and sufficient.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
	1. <i>Relevance</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.3
	2. <i>Approach</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.6
	3. <i>Technical Accomplishments and Progress</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.4
	4. <i>Technology Transfer/Collaboration</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.4
	5. <i>Proposed Future Research</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.6
27.	The right criteria and weightings were used to evaluate the project(s)/program.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
	1. <i>Relevance</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.2
	2. <i>Approach</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.5
	3. <i>Technical Accomplishments and Progress</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.7
	4. <i>Technology Transfer/Collaboration</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.5
	5. <i>Proposed Future Research</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.7
28.	There were no problems with the rating scheme (1 through 4) that was available to the Peer Reviewers.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.6
29.	During the review, reviewers had adequate access to the Principal Investigators.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.2
30.	Information on the location and timing of the projects was adequate and easy to find.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.7
31.	The number of projects I was expected to review was						
	a. Too many <u>11</u>						
	b. Too few <u>4</u>						
	c. About right <u>81</u>						
32.	The reviewers in your session had the proper mix and depth of credentials for the purpose of the review.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.2
		<u>27</u>	<i>Don't know their credentials</i>				
33.	Altogether, the preparatory materials, presentations, and the Question & Answer period provided sufficient depth for a meaningful review.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.2

C. QUESTIONS 34 THROUGH 45 FOR PRESENTERS ONLY

34.	The request to provide a presentation for the review was provided sufficiently prior to the deadline for submission.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.6
35.	Instructions for preparing the presentation were sufficient.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.4
36.	The template for the presentation was helpful.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.4
37.	The PDF format provided adequate functionality for my presentation.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.3

APPENDIX C: FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDATIONS

38.	The time limit for my presentation was adequate to present the information needed by reviewers.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.6
39.	The audio and visual equipment worked properly and were adequate.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.6
40.	The evaluation criteria upon which the review was organized were clearly defined and used appropriately.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
	1. <i>Relevance</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.3
	2. <i>Approach</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.4
	3. <i>Technical Accomplishments and Progress</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.4
	4. <i>Technology Transfer/Collaboration</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.1
	5. <i>Proposed Future Research</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.3
41.	Explanation of the questions within the criteria was clear and sufficient.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
	1. <i>Relevance</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.3
	2. <i>Approach</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.3
	3. <i>Technical Accomplishments and Progress</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.3
	4. <i>Technology Transfer/Collaboration</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.1
	5. <i>Proposed Future Research</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.2
42.	The right criteria and weightings were used to evaluate the project(s)/program.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
	1. <i>Relevance</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.0
	2. <i>Approach</i>	1	2	3	4	5	3.9
	3. <i>Technical Accomplishments and Progress</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.1
	4. <i>Technology Transfer/Collaboration</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.1
	5. <i>Proposed Future Research</i>	1	2	3	4	5	4.1
43.	There were no problems with the rating scheme (1 through 4) that was used by the Peer Reviewers.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.1
44.	During the review, reviewers had adequate access to the Principal Investigators.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	4.0
45.	Altogether, the preparatory materials, presentations, and the Question & Answer period provided sufficient depth of review.	<i>disagree</i>				<i>agree</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5	3.9