

# Limited Submission Scoring Matrix

## J&J WiSTEM<sup>2</sup>D Scholars Program

Principal Investigator(s):

### BACKGROUND & INSTRUCTIONS

A “limited submission” refers to a grant program that places a limitation on the number of proposal applications a single eligible entity can submit each cycle. The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) has a process in place to allow for an internal competition among interested PIs to determine which application(s) will move forward. Once a limited submission opportunity is identified, an internal call for pre-proposals is sent out to potential PIs. Those interested in being considered for full submission are required to submit a pre-proposal by a specified date. If more applications are received than the institution is allowed to submit to the sponsor, the applications are moved forward to a peer review process in order to make final selection(s).

That peer review process is what you are taking part in now. While we do want you to be aware that the proposals you review here are *not* finalized and will be expanded before they are submitted to the sponsor, we ask that you be as critical in your review as you would be if these applications were moving forward to a sponsor now. We are especially interested in your feedback on weaknesses of the applications and where improvements can be made either before they move forward through submission to this program or others.

If you are reviewing more than one application for this same program, we ask that you use the applications as a reference for one another in your scoring, knowing that the pool will be ranked based on scores received to determine which move(s) forward to the sponsor.

Selection of applications to be submitted to the Johnson & Johnson Scholars Award Program will be based on a 5-point scoring scale for criteria given below.

No. of applications allowed per institution this cycle: 6 (one applicant per each STEM2D discipline: Science, Technology, Engineering, Math, Manufacturing and Design)

- Ratings should be given in whole numbers (not decimals).
- Reviewers should consider not only the relative number of strengths and weaknesses, but also the importance of these strengths and weaknesses to the criteria or to the overall impact when determining a score.
  - For example, a major strength may outweigh many minor and correctable weaknesses

Limited Submission Scoring Matrix  
**J&J WiSTEM<sup>2</sup>D Scholars Program**  
Rubric

Impact	Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance
High	1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
	2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
	3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
Medium	4	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
	5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
	6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
Low	7	Fair	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
	8	Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
	9	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

**Reviewer Guidance and Chart**

- For the impact score and for the individual criterion scores, the far right column (in the table below) provides a descriptive guide of how strengths and weaknesses are considered in assigning a rating.
  - Minor weakness:** easily addressable weakness, does not substantially lessen impact
  - Moderate weakness:** lessens impact
  - Major weakness:** Severely limits impact
- Impact (far left column) is the project's likelihood to have a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved.
  - High Impact = 1 through 3
  - Moderate Impact = 4 through 6
  - Low Impact = 7 through 9

## Limited Submission Scoring Matrix J&J WiSTEM<sup>2</sup>D Scholars Program

Impact	Score	Descriptor	Strengths/Weaknesses
High Impact	1	Exceptional	
	2	Outstanding	
	3	Excellent	
Moderate Impact	4	Very Good	
	5	Good	
	6	Satisfactory	
Low Impact	7	Fair	
	8	Marginal	
	9	Poor	

### SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA

Reviewers will consider each of the five review criteria below in the determination of scientific and technical merit, and give a separate score for each.

*Below, please summarize the factors that informed your individual criteria scores:*

<p><b>1. Significance</b></p> <p><b>Strengths:</b> <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a></p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b> <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a></p>
---

<p><b>2. Investigators</b></p> <p><b>Strengths:</b> <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a></p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b> <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a></p>
--

## Limited Submission Scoring Matrix J&J WiSTEM<sup>2</sup>D Scholars Program

### 3. [Innovation](#)

Strengths: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Weaknesses: [Click here to enter text.](#)

### 4. [Approach](#)

Strengths: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Weaknesses: [Click here to enter text.](#)

### 5. [Relevance to Funder's Mission \(See Johnson & Johnson Credo \[Here\]\(#\)\)](#)

Strengths: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Weaknesses: [Click here to enter text.](#)

## OVERALL IMPACT

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, in consideration of the following five scored review criteria, and additional review criteria. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

## Limited Submission Scoring Matrix J&J WiSTEM<sup>2</sup>D Scholars Program

*Overall Impact- Please summarize the factors that informed your Overall Impact score.*

Click here to enter text.

### ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO APPLICANT

Reviewers may provide guidance to the applicant or recommend against resubmission without fundamental revision.

[Additional Comments to Applicants](#) (Optional)

Click here to enter text.

**Individual Impact Scores** (Use 1-9 matrix as described on page 1.)

1. Significance: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Innovation: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Approach: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Relevance to Funder's Mission: \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall Impact Score:** \_\_\_\_\_ (The impact score should reflect the reviewer's overall evaluation, NOT a numerical average of individual criterion scores. Use the 1-9 matrix as described on page 1.)