

Aeroacoustics Research Consortium

Proposal Evaluation Criteria and Weighting

1. The importance of the proposed research and perceived benefit to consortium members in contributing to the solution of a specific problem in jet noise, core noise, computational aeroacoustics, and fan broadband noise (30%)
 - a. Significant importance would be indicated by: unanimous or near-unanimous agreement in member technical evaluations on the strong relevance of proposed work, and that the results achieved from the research will be readily applicable by members.
 - b. Moderate importance would be indicated by: significant divergence of opinion on the relevance or importance of the work to consortium members, or consensus agreement that the work is of moderate importance.
 - c. Limited importance would be indicated by consensus agreement that the work is of limited benefit to the group.
2. Consistency of (1) resource requirements, (2) technical approach, (3) proposed schedule and (4) level of effort, with stated research goals and clearly stated deliverables. (30%)
 - a. Proposal has strong alignment of resources, schedule and effort indicated by well developed schedule, budget, and level of effort. These are fully consistent with the research objectives proposed.
 - b. Proposal has acceptable alignment of resources, schedule and effort to proposed research objectives, with some minor challenges identified.
 - c. Proposal has highly questionable alignment of resources, schedule and level of effort to proposed research objectives.
3. Qualifications of researcher(s) proposed to perform the effort (20%)
 - a. Strong qualifications would be indicated by the fact that the researcher is an internationally recognized expert.
 - b. Acceptable qualifications would be indicated by the fact that the researcher is a nationally recognized expert.
 - c. Limited qualifications would be indicated by the fact that the researcher has little experience or is unknown in the field.

In evaluating proposals, Consortium members will weigh the proportion of time to be devoted to the research effort by the Principal Investigator, vs. the proportion of time devoted to the research effort by graduate students or other supporting personnel. Thus, it is more advantageous to have a greater proportion of the work performed by the PI.

4. Depth and duration of interaction proposed between researcher and Consortium Members(20%)
 - a. Ideal depth and duration of interaction would be indicated by: significant interaction with consortium members well beyond required minimum residency requirements.
 - b. Acceptable depth and duration of interaction would be indicated by: meets visit requirements.
 - c. Limited depth and duration of interaction would be indicated by an intent to carry out all research efforts and activities at a non-consortium institution, with no visits anticipated and results presented through written reports only.

Proposals may be funded under the auspices of either an OAI/NASA cooperative agreement or via OAI/Industry teaming agreement.

In addition to the criteria above, resource limitations may preclude the immediate funding of a proposal that is desirable in all respects above. The Consortium may defer consideration of proposals pending availability of resources.