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March 7, 1990

Dear 1990 GOS Panel Member:

The IMS staff and NMSB members are looking forward to working with you at the Panel Meeting, March 21-23, 1990. We anticipate that the three days will be very busy. To facilitate efficient use of your time while you are in Washington, we are enclosing the balance of your panel assignments with this letter so that you can become familiar with them and be prepared for the panel activities.

The enclosed material primarily belongs to two categories: 1) problematic reviews; and 2) revised GOS draft application guidelines. Instructions for each category are attached. A third item is the response from the Ella Sharp Museum regarding the similarity of their application to the sample narrative.

Additional information on the following issues will be provided at the meeting:

--distribution of awards by budget, discipline, and region;
--statistical information on reviewer pool;
--enhanced role of panel in GOS review;
--suggestions for revision of GOS application; and
--recommendations of past GOS panels.

Please call me or Steve Shwartzman if you have any questions or comments. We appreciate the contribution you are making of your time and expertise to the GOS program.

Sincerely,

Rebecca W. Danvers
Program Director

Enclosures
STAFF COMMENTS direct your attention to the specific staff concern and may provide additional information.

PANELIST SCORING OPTIONS provides four possible recommendations for resolution. You can also indicate whether IMS should send the applicant a disclaimer with the review sheet.*

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION gives you space to record your reasons for your recommendation and helps IMS staff improve instructions to reviewers and applicants and explain your recommendation to the applicant.

2. 1990 GOS Face Sheet. The Face Sheet provides identifying information about the applicant.

3. Application review sheet. The review sheet(s) include the problematic comment(s).

4. GOS application sections. We have sent sections of the application that correspond to the reviewers' problematic comments. You need only read the questions within each section that correspond to the reviewer's comment. In all cases we have included the applicant's statement of purpose. Only a few cases require you to read the entire application. If you need additional information about any application, we will provide that at the panel meeting.

Additional information on type size/reformatting

In some cases you will have an application that has been marked as being penalized for type size or reformatting AND additional problems. You do not need to consider the issue of type size or reformatting. We will handle all cases in those categories according to the recommendations of the 1989 GOS panel. Therefore, if the only problem with the review is about type size or reformatting, we have not sent them to you. IMS staff will track this issue to determine any changes in the scope of the problem.

*(Note: Sending a disclaimer is an option for any recommendation except in the case that the entire review is disregarded. In that case, we do not send the review sheet to the applicant.)
PANEL REVIEW SHEET
1990 Conservation Project Support

Panelist Name ________________________________

Application # IC-90 __________ Panel # __________

Institution ________________________________

Panelist Recommendation: A - FUND ____ C - NOT FUND ____

AMOUNT RECOMMENDED $____________

Funded for: All activities ____ Partial activities ____

Partial Activities. (If you are recommending funding for only part of the identified project activities, clearly identify which activities you are recommending for funding and indicate why you do not recommend supporting the other project activities.)

Summarize under each area below your evaluation of the application. Your comments are used, with the field reviewer comments, to justify the funding status of the project to the applicant. Your concerns regarding weaknesses in the application should be specifically identified. The areas and questions within each area are generally based on experience of past panel considerations, and are provided only as a guide to you. You may have other concerns or comments not identified here. You should feel free to adapt this form as needed.

Design. (Is the design for the project reasonable and likely to be successfully completed? If inappropriate, how could the project design be improved?)

Methods. (Are methods appropriate? If they are inappropriate, for what reasons?)

OVER
Budget. (Are the cost categories identified appropriate to the project activities? Costs that are unreasonably high or low should be identified.)

Key project personnel. (Are project personnel adequately qualified for the project? Is time designated to project activities appropriate?)

Supporting documentation. (Does the documentation adequately support the proposed activities? Does the documentation demonstrate the appropriateness of the project to the institutional conservation needs and priorities?)

 Appropriateness for IMS CP program. (Are identified activities clearly appropriate for the IMS Conservation Project Support program? If not, how are they inappropriate?)

General/Other Comments:
Revision of GOS Application Guidelines

IMS hopes to reduce the burden on the applicant and the reviewer with changes in the GOS application guidelines. With this goal in mind, we have developed a draft of the guidelines that combines short answer and prose narrative. The content of this draft is very similar to that of the 1990 application guidelines.

While we wish to reduce the burden for our applicants, we realize reviewers still need adequate information on which to base their evaluations. You will undoubtedly have many ideas on how to improve the guidelines. We look forward to a lively discussion on the matter.

Please note: The draft of the application forms incorporate many instructions previously found in other parts of the guidelines. The additional instructions (following page 34) will be available at the panel meeting. We anticipate that the current draft will vastly reduce the need to reference other instructions. We would like your ideas on other ways to incorporate instructions into the forms themselves. You may want to refer to the 1990 guidelines for reference.
Instructions for Problematic Reviews

We define a problematic review as a case where the reviewer may have unfairly evaluated an application. IMS staff reads all reviewer comments for evidence of unfairness. The problems we have identified are assigned to you for a recommendation for resolution.

Regardless of the likelihood of funding, all applications with identified problems are presented to panel. Our primary concern is that each applicant has a review that is as fair as possible.

We have assigned applications to you by topic and discipline, as listed on the attached assignment list. Each application with a problematic review is assigned to two panelists.

You will have time on March 21 to consult with your co-panelist on your recommendations for resolution. Each application will be discussed separately. One panelist will give the recommendation to the full panel. We will generally follow the order of the preliminary agenda sent to you earlier. Some adjustments may be made in the agenda.

For each of your assigned applications you will have the following materials as one set:

PLEASE BRING THIS MATERIAL WITH YOU TO THE PANEL MEETING!

1) 1990 GOS Panel Review Sheet. This sheet provides a staff summary of the problem and your options for resolving it. Information is provided in the following categories.

APPLICANT identifies the applicant by name, log number, and field review panel assignment.

PROBLEM REVIEWER identifies the field reviewer by first name only and gives the two panelists assigned to the application.

PROBLEMATIC CRITERIA identifies the section of the review sheet which has the problem comment.

NATURE OF PROBLEM identifies which type of problem the comment may indicate.
1990 GOS PANEL REVIEW SHEET

APPLICANT: Dallas Co. Heritage Soc. IG-00774 PANEL 76

PROBLEM REVIEWER: Lynne PANELISTS: Quigley & Ganong

PROBLEMATIC CRITERIA:
1) Audience  6) Staff/Physical Facilities
2) Collections  7) Support
3) Collections Care/Mgmt.  8) Administration X
4) Exhibits  9) Long Range Plans
5) Education and Research

NATURE OF PROBLEM:
Used prior/outside knowledge Need used as a criterion
Imposition of own standards Non-collecting inappropriate
Penalized for missing items Inappropriate remarks X
Eligibility questions raised Penalized for reduced type
Penalized for reformatting Other

STAFF COMMENTS
Makes caustic remarks like, "This is the most archaic and appalling management structure."

PANELIST SCORING OPTIONS: (Please check appropriate box)

1) No change in review status
2) Enter average score for one or more criteria:
   a) Criteria # Enter Average Score of
   b) Criteria # Enter Average Score of
   c) Criteria # Enter Average Score of

3) Enter new score for one or more criteria:
   (Round all fractions up to nearest whole number)
   a) Criteria # Enter New Score of
   b) Criteria # Enter New Score of
   c) Criteria # Enter New Score of

Should a DISCLAIMER be sent to this applicant? yes no

4) Disregard entire review (IMS will average remaining reviews)

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION: