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.



SCORING

Selection of applications to be submitted to the <u>The Camille Dreyfus Teacher-Scholar Awards Program</u> will be based on a 5-point scoring scale for criteria given below.

No. of applications allowed per institution this cycle: 1

- Ratings should be given in whole numbers (no 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	Inadequate – No evidence or information provided	
2	Weak – Minimal evidence; limited potential; vague; weak concepts; limited likelihood of success; limited in innovative thinking; lacks sufficient information	
3	Marginal – Some evidence; partially developed concepts; some potential for effectiveness and success; some inconsistencies; needs work; some innovation present; requires additional information/clarification	
4	Good – Convincing concepts with enough examples of evidence to indicate a good chance for success; clear and complete; innovative	
5	Exemplary – Excellent concepts; exceptional evidence; well-thought out with an extremely high likelihood of success; exemplary; highly innovative	



SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA

Please consider each of the review criteria below in the determination of merit, and give a separate score for each, based on the rubric above.

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

1. Advancement of Important Knowledge			
Is there evidence of the nominee's impact towards the advancement of important knowledge in the			
chemical sciences?			
Strengths: Click here to enter text.			
Offeriguis. Click here to enter text.			
Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.			
Weakinesses. Click here to enter text.			
2. Dedication and Contribution to Education			
Has the nominee demonstrated a dedicated effort and contributions towards education, particularly			
of undergraduates, in the chemical sciences?			
Strengths: Click here to enter text.			
Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.			
2. Passagel Blan			
3. Research Plan			
Has the nominee presented a clear, strong approach and project plan that integrate both research			
and education? Has the nominee demonstrated that they have the knowledge and resources to			
achieve the stated aims/objectives?			
Strongths: Click have to enter toyt			
Strengths: Click here to enter text.			
Weaknesses: Click hard to enter text			



4. Research Accomplishments Has the nominee been the recipient of awards and honors? Have they published their research achievements in leading journals? Have they had independent success in attracting research funding?	
Strengths: Click here to enter text.	
Weaknesses: 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
Advancement of Important Knowledge	
Dedication and Contribution to Education	
3. Research Plan	
4. Research Accomplishments	
Total Score	

