

TECHNICAL REVIEWERS' RATING SUMMARY

R027-A

Gateway to Science Ethanol Exhibit

ND Ethanol Council

Principal Investigator: Deana Wiese

Request for \$50,000; Total Project Costs \$110,080

<u>Rating Category</u>	<u>Weighting Factor</u>	<u>1A</u>	<u>2A</u>	<u>Average Weighted Score</u>
1. Objectives	9	4	4	36.00
2. Achievability	9	4	3	31.50
3. Methodology	7	3	4	24.50
4. Contribution	7	3	4	24.50
5. Awareness	5	3	3	15.00
6. Background	5	4	4	20.00
7. Project Management	2	3	4	7.00
8. Equipment Purchase	2	3	5	8.00
9. Facilities	2	5	5	10.00
10. Budget	2	4	4	8.00
Average Weighted Score		179	190	184.50
Maximum Weighted Score				250.00

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

FUND	X	X
FUNDING MAY BE CONSIDERED		
DO NOT FUND		

R027-A
Gateway to Science Ethanol Exhibit
Submitted by ND Ethanol Council
Principal Investigator: Deana Wiese
Request for \$50,000; Total Project Costs \$110,080

- 1. The objectives or goals of the proposed project with respect to clarity and consistency with North Dakota Industrial Commission/Renewable Energy Council goals are: 1 – very unclear; 2 – unclear; 3 – clear; 4 – very clear; or 5 – exceptionally clear.**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 4)

Project promotes the industry and increases public awareness.

Reviewer 2A (Rating: 4)

Objectives and goals were stated and repeated several times. Proposed diagram for the exhibit appears to support educating to the ethanol lifecycle.

- 2. With the approach suggested and time and budget available, the objectives are: 1 – not achievable; 2 – possibly achievable; 3 – likely achievable; 4 – most likely achievable; or 5 – certainly achievable.**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 4)

Based on firm commitments of match dollar partners.

Reviewer 2A (Rating: 3)

The timeline appears solid. There is no indication of estimated exhibit size or level of complexity to assess the budget. The illustrations provided suggest a single counter display – perhaps 10' deep and 30' long. It is difficult to tell.

- 3. The quality of the methodology displayed in the proposal is: 1 – well below average; 2 – below average; 3 – average; 4 – above average; or 5 – well above average.**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 3)

Good base regarding public awareness from exhibit. I didn't have a complete picture of what the display would do or the complete learnings from students.

Reviewer 2A (Rating: 4)

The methods are well-stated and outlined. I really like the pilot exhibit to assess needs and direction of the permanent exhibit. Defining and capturing the exhibit results will be the challenge. The ability to connect visitor interaction with long-term ethanol use or increased interest in STEM fields will be next to impossible to correlate. A possible measure of success might be to incorporate project-based curriculum for educators and then follow up to determine how many educators/visitors are incorporating the ethanol exhibit curriculum in the classroom.

- 4. The scientific and/or technical contribution of the proposed work to specifically address North Dakota Industrial Commission/Renewable Energy Council goals will likely be: 1 – extremely small; 2 – small; 3 – significant; 4 – very significant; or 5 – extremely significant.**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 3)

Exhibit will definitely meet promotional goals, and potentially inspire more students toward careers in the industry.

Reviewer 2A (Rating: 4)

This proposal falls solidly in line with four of the six stated goals and purposes for the Renewal Energy Council. It also supports well three, and possibly five, of the eight stated goals and objectives for grant priority.

- 5. The principal investigator's awareness of current research activity and published literature as evidenced by literature referenced and its interpretation and by the reference to unpublished research related to the proposal is: 1 – very limited; 2 – limited; 3 – adequate; 4 – better than average; or 5 – exceptional.**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 3)

It was stated that no other ethanol based exhibits of this nature were found. Understanding the outcomes of other renewable energy awareness exhibits of this nature would have been helpful.

Reviewer 2A (Rating: 3)

The proposal references support for ethanol industry promotion and advocacy. It also acknowledges the newness of the industry and thus, limited available resources for reference.

- 6. The background of the investigator(s) as related to the proposed work is: 1 – very limited; 2 – limited; 3 – adequate; 4 – better than average; or 5 – exceptional.**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 4)

Investigator has a long history with the industry and connections to development of the science center.

Reviewer 2A (Rating: 4)

Solid background. The proposal may benefit from including an educator or curriculum developer to include direct connections and classroom application, if this is not already in place.

- 7. The project management plan, including a well-defined milestone chart, schedule, financial plan, and plan for communications among the investigators and subcontractors, if any, is: 1 – very inadequate; 2 – inadequate; 3 – adequate; 4 – very good; or 5 – exceptionally good.**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 3)

Plan for timeline and budget were provided, but milestones/\$ were general. There was no stated communication plan other than progress reports.

Reviewer 2A (Rating: 4)

Looks acceptable.

- 8. The proposed purchase of equipment is: 1 – extremely poorly justified; 2 – poorly justified; 3 – justified; 4 – well justified; or 5 – extremely well justified. (Circle 5 if no equipment is to be purchased.)**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 3)

Assuming the exhibit will need equipment, but no specific asks for equipment were defined.

Reviewer 2A (Rating: 5)

Unable to identify based on submission.

- 9. The facilities and equipment available and to be purchased for the proposed research are: 1 – very inadequate; 2 – inadequate; 3 – adequate; 4 – notably good; or 5 – exceptionally good.**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 5)

The Science Museum of Minnesota is well-respected in this area of expertise.

Reviewer 2A (Rating: 5)

Assume exceptionally good given grant partners.

- 10. The proposed budget “value”¹ relative to the outlined work and the financial commitment from other sources² is of: 1 – very low value; 2 – low value; 3 – average value; 4 – high value; or 5 – very high value. (See below)**

Reviewer 1A (Rating: 4)

The result of the dollars will support awareness and understanding of the industry in a long-term investment.

Reviewer 2A (Rating: 4)

There is good logic to support this venue for the proposed project.

¹ “Value” – The value of the projected work and technical outcome for the budgeted amount of the project, based on your estimate of what the work might cost in research settings with which you are familiar.

² Financial commitment from other sources – A minimum of 50% of the total project must come from other sources to meet the program guidelines. Higher priority is to be given if the application has private industry investment equal to or at least 50% or more of total cost.

Section C. Overall Comments and Recommendations:

Please comment in a general way about the merits and flaws of the proposed project and make a recommendation whether or not to fund.

Reviewer 1A (Fund)

Overall, the proposal was good, but would have liked to know more about the product and what overall the learning from it could be.

The “what” was clearly defined but in general terms throughout.

My scoring reflects that this is a good project and the right thing to do for the industry; however, the proposal doesn’t give adequate detail in that regard. General reviewer knowledge was used for some gaps in information and in other areas, good intent needed to be assumed as no detail was provided.

Reviewer 2A (Fund)

Recommend funding.

Would suggest consideration of additional budget dollars for more detailed or varied post-exhibit assessment to better reflect actual value of exhibit.