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**INSTRUCTIONS:** This evaluation should be completed by the WisDOT project manager, project oversight committee member(s) and/or technical oversight committee members who have experience with the project. Evaluations should
be based primarily on the performance of the Principal Investigator (PI) and not necessarily the PI’s institution or subcontractors. All evaluations are recorded and kept on file by the WisDOT Research Program for use in future selection processes. All evaluations are subject to Open Records availability.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **WisDOT research program category:**[ ]  Policy research [ ]  Wisconsin Highway Research Program[ ]  Other [ ]  Pooled fund TPF#       | Evaluator role:[ ]  WisDOT project manager[ ]  Project oversight committee member[ ]  Technical oversight committee member |
| Evaluator:       | Phone:        | Email:       |
| Project Title:       |
| Principal Investigator:       | Institution:       | WisDOT Project ID:       |

**Section 1: Communication, interaction and responsiveness**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Very Good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Poor** | **Don’t Know / Not Applicable** |
| a. PI maintained regular and adequate communication with project staff throughout the project | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| b. PI responded to project staff requests in a timely and professional manner | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| c. PI submitted laboratory, field test, survey or other research parameters for advance review and approval | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| d. PI conveyed technical issues or concerns or sought project staff guidance in a timely manner | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| e. PI worked proactively to identify and resolve problems (e.g. test delays, inadequate survey responses) | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Comments on researcher communication, interaction and responsiveness:      |

**Section 2: Research performance and technical quality**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Very Good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Poor** | **Don’t Know / Not Applicable** |
| a. PI effectively addressed the research objectives as defined in the project work plan | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| b. PI’s research methods were technically valid | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| c. PI’s data / findings were technically valid | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| d. The data / findings support the research recommendations | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

*(continued)*

**Section 2: Research performance and technical quality *(continued)***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Very Good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Poor** | **Don’t Know / Not Applicable** |
| e. PI identified potential opportunities for WisDOT implementation | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| f. PI conducted research activities in a cooperative and timely manner | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| g. PI effectively managed subcontractors on the project | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Comments on research performance and technical quality:      |

**Section 3: Final deliverables**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Very Good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Poor** | **Don’t Know / Not Applicable** |
| a. PI delivered a draft final report in a timely manner | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| b. The draft final report was well written and easily understood | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| c. The draft final report clearly documented the data, findings and recommendations of the research | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| d. PI’s presentation was of high quality | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| e. PI was able to answer questions, address concerns and discuss findings in the presentation | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| f. PI adequately responded to comments received on draft final report | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| g. PI submitted final report in a timely manner after receiving comments on draft | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Comments on researcher’s final deliverables:      |

**Section 4: Overall performance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Very Good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Poor** | **Don’t Know / Not Applicable** |
| a. Please assess the total performance of the PI on this research project | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Comments on researcher’s overall performance:      |