**INSTRUCTIONS:** This evaluation will be completed via a survey through Microsoft forms by the NDOT Research Section, the NDOT TAC Lead Member, and the NDOT TAC Project Members. Evaluation would be based on the performance of the Principal Investigator (PI) and not on the PI’s institution or Co-PI’s. All evaluations are recorded and kept on file by the NDOT Research Section for use in future research project selection.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Research Section’s Evaluation of Principal Investigator** | Exceeds  | Meets | Almost Meets | Does Not Meet | Don't Know/NA |
| 1. PI submitted quarterly reports on time | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 2. PI maintained adequate communication and responded to research section requests in a timely manner | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 3. PI provided a detailed description of items completed per task schedule when submitting the quarterly reports | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 4. PI informed the PM immediately of any change in project progress that suggest a future need for changes to project cost, scope, or schedule | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 5. PI ensured that project charges are accurate and eligible | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 6. PI managed project budget, scope, and schedule efficiently | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 7. PI delivered a draft final report on time | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 8. PI provided in the quarterly report each task number completed and a detailed description of all work accomplished under the task as described on the approved project proposal | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 9. Received Final Report (PDF & Hardcopy) | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 10. Final Presentation-presented in a professional manner |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |
|  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Lead TAC Member’s Evaluation of Principal Investigator** | Exceeds  | Meets | Almost Meets | Does Not Meet | Don't Know/NA |
| 1. PI maintained communication throughout the project | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 2. After submitted draft research report, PI responded to TAC review/comments and made changes, as needed | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 3. PI responded effectively to feedback, if any, as directed | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 4. PI informed immediately if any setback due to any unforeseen circumstances to the project, either by email, during the TAC meeting updates or when submitting the Quarterly Reports  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 5. PI effectively addressed the research objectives as defined in the project proposal | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 6. PI ensured updates were supplied on a timely basis | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 7. PI’s research methods were technically valid | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 8. The data/findings supported the research recommendations | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 9. PI conducted research activities in a cooperative and timely manner | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 10. After submitted draft research report, PI responded to TAC review/comments and made changes, as needed | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 11. The draft final report clearly documented the data, findings, and recommendations of the research; PI adequately responded to comments received on draft final report. | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 12. PI was able to answer questions, address concerns and discuss findings during the TAC update meetings and final presentations and the meetings were of high quality and well prepared. | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Comments: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TAC Member’s Evaluation of Principal Investigator** | Exceeds  | Meets | Almost Meets | Does Not Meet | Don't Know/NA |
| 1. PI maintained communication throughout the project | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 2. After submitted draft research report, PI responded to TAC review/comments and made changes, as needed | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 3. PI responded effectively to feedback, if any, as directed | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 4. PI informed immediately if any setback due to any unforeseen circumstances to the project, either by email, during the TAC meeting updates or when submitting the Quarterly Reports | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 5. PI effectively addressed the research objectives as defined in the project proposal | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 6. PI ensured updates were supplied on a timely basis | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 7. The draft final report was well written and easily understood | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 8. The draft final report clearly documented the data, findings, and recommendations of the research | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 9. PI’s TAC meetings and the final presentation were of high quality and well prepared | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 10. PI was able to answer questions, address concerns and discuss findings during the TAC update meetings and the final presentation | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 11. PI adequately responded to comments received on draft final report | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Comments: |