

# Limited Submission Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix NIGMS Collaborative Program Grant for Multidisciplinary Teams (RM1)

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.

# Limited Submission Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix NIGMS Collaborative Program Grant for Multidisciplinary Teams (RM1)

## SCORING

Selection of applications to be submitted to the NIGMS Collaborative Program Grant for Multidisciplinary Teams (RM1) will be based on a 5-point scoring scale for criteria given below. Scores for each criteria will then be weighted based on program specifications.

**No. of applications allowed per institution this cycle: 1**

- 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

**Minor weakness:** easily addressable weakness, does not substantially lessen impact

**Moderate weakness:** lessens impact

**Major weakness:** Severely limits impact

## SCORING RUBRIC

Score	Description
1	<b>Poor</b> – No evidence or information provided
2	<b>Fair</b> – Minimal evidence; limited potential; vague; weak concepts; limited likelihood of success; limited in innovative thinking; lacks sufficient information
3	<b>Good</b> – Some evidence; partially developed concepts; some potential for effectiveness and success; some inconsistencies; needs work; some innovation present; requires additional information/clarification
4	<b>Very Good</b> – Convincing concepts with enough examples of evidence to indicate a good chance for success; clear and complete; innovative
5	<b>Excellent</b> – Excellent concepts; exceptional evidence; well-thought out with an extremely high likelihood of success; exemplary; highly innovative

*Borrowed from State of Ohio's Straight A Fund Application Scoring & Evaluation Process, Criteria & Rubrics.*

# Limited Submission Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix NIGMS Collaborative Program Grant for Multidisciplinary Teams (RM1)

## SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA

Reviewers should consider each of the review criteria below and give a separate score for each.

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

### **1. Significance**

Is the program of sufficient scope and complexity, and of sufficient potential impact, to warrant a team approach? Do the specific aims form a single cohesive program, and if accomplished will these aims advance the stated goals of the program? Is the problem such that definitive outcomes can be accomplished during the funding period? If successful, will the proposed program's coordinated research effort uniquely advance a scientific field/community that increases basic research for understanding biological processes?

**Strengths:** Click here to enter text.

**Weaknesses:** Click here to enter text.

### **2. Investigator(s)**

Is the planned effort by the PD/PIs appropriate and sufficient for the work proposed? Are the critical mass and diversity of investigator backgrounds and expertise sufficient to address the proposed scientific problem? Is it clear that each investigator is necessary and will contribute to achieving the goals of the program? Is there evidence for synergistic interactions among PD/PIs beyond the additive benefits of additional investigators? If the application includes collaborating investigators who will not receive direct support, is it clear how these investigators will participate in the program? If foreign investigators are involved are they uniquely qualified to participate in the team?

**Strengths:** Click here to enter text.

**Weaknesses:** Click here to enter text.

# Limited Submission Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix

## NIGMS Collaborative Program Grant for Multidisciplinary Teams (RM1)

### 3. Innovation

Does the program involve innovative ideas or approaches that would be very difficult to pursue through independently funded individual or multiple PD/PI research project grants? Does the program involve innovative combinations of scientific fields and/or intellectual viewpoints to address its goals? Is innovation evident in the method that established areas of science are combined?

**Strengths:** Click here to enter text.

**Weaknesses:** Click here to enter text.

### 4. Approach – Research Program

Is the program presented as a coherent and fully integrated set of specific aims or objectives? Are the approaches and personnel appropriate for the specific aims proposed? Are the timeline and milestones proposed appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims? Are the resources and infrastructure adequate for accomplishing the specific aims and supporting team science? Are any plans for technology development necessary to address the scientific problems and specifically focused on these problems as opposed to being more general technology development goals? If new databases or resource collections will be developed, are they well justified and clearly ancillary to the research goals? Does the work plan make adequate use of existing institutional and regional resources? If new resources or equipment are requested, are they well-justified and not redundant with resources available elsewhere in the institution or region? If a second five-year period is anticipated, are long-term, ten-year objectives clearly described? Do plans include criteria for making the go/no-go decision for a renewal application?

**Strengths:** Click here to enter text.

**Weaknesses:** Click here to enter text.

### 5. Approach – Team Management Plan

Does the team management plan describe adequately the governance and processes that will be used for decision making? Does the plan allow for flexibility in pursuing the aims and allocation of resources? Does the plan assure that all investigators are encouraged to have a voice in decision making so that no single PD/PI will become overly dominant? Is the team management plan

# Limited Submission Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix

## NIGMS Collaborative Program Grant for Multidisciplinary Teams (RM1)

complementary to the multiple PD/PI plan? Does it provide for effective team leadership and management with distributed responsibility and decision-making processes? Is the team plan sufficiently detailed to create a sustainable environment for maintaining trust and shared vision? Does the management plan include adequate plans for shared professional credit? Is there evidence of institutional buy-in for shared professional credit for team activities that is sufficient for professional advancement? If shared research resources will be utilized, are plans adequate to ensure that all team members will have the access they require? If an external advisory committee is proposed, is the plan for this appropriate? If a scientific program manager or coordinator is proposed, are the qualifications and role of this individual appropriate? Are adequate plans presented to establish and sustain a team of researchers with an optimal range of backgrounds, expertise and skills and plans to arrive at major decisions, accounting for diverse points of view?

**Strengths:** Click here to enter text.

**Weaknesses:** Click here to enter text.

### 6. Environment

Is there synergy to be gained from the involvement of multiple departments and institutions? Will the range of departments and/or institutions involved enhance the diversity of the team in terms of the backgrounds, expertise and skills of the researchers? If foreign organizations are involved do they provide unique resources that are not otherwise available?

**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 Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix NIGMS Collaborative Program Grant for Multidisciplinary Teams (RM1)

*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 submission without fundamental revision.

**Additional Comments to Applicants (Optional)**

Click here to enter text.

## Evaluation Scores

Criteria	Your Score
1. Significance	
2. Investigator(s)	
3. Innovation	
4. Approach – Research Program	
5. Approach – Team Management Plan	
6. Environment	
7. Overall Impact (The impact score should reflect the reviewer’s overall evaluation, NOT a numerical average of individual criterion scores)	
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	