

Limited Submission Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix

NSF Partnerships for Innovation (PFI)

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 NSF Partnerships for Innovation (PFI)

SCORING

Selection of applications to be submitted to the **NSF Partnerships for Innovation (PFI) Program** 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: 2

- 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	Poor – No evidence or information provided
2	Fair – Minimal evidence; limited potential; vague; weak concepts; limited likelihood of success; limited in innovative thinking; lacks sufficient information
3	Good – Some evidence; partially developed concepts; some potential for effectiveness and success; some inconsistencies; needs work; some innovation present; requires additional information/clarification
4	Very Good – Convincing concepts with enough examples of evidence to indicate a good chance for success; clear and complete; innovative
5	Excellent – 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

NSF Partnerships for Innovation (PFI)

SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA

Reviewers should consider each of the review criteria below and give a separate score for each. Note – additional solicitation specific review criteria have been incorporated into the primary six standard NSF review criteria below.

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

1. Potential for Advancing Knowledge

Potential of the proposed activity to advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields (Intellectual Merit). The intellectual merit of the proposed translational research to overcome the identified technological hurdles and knowledge gaps. The strength of the prior research results in supporting the assertion that the technology is ready to move beyond the basic research phase and that the translational research proposed has the potential to be successful.

Strengths: Click here to enter text.

Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.

2. Potential for Advancing Societal Outcomes

Potential for the proposed activity to benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes (Broader Impacts). The merits of fostering the inclusion of women and individuals from underrepresented groups in the proposed technology translation and in future commercialization endeavors. If successful, the extent to which the proposed project will contribute to, or result in, the development of an innovation ecosystem. *Broader impacts may be accomplished through the research itself, through activities that are directly related to specific research projects, or through activities that are supported by, but are complementary to, the project. The project activities may be based on previously established and/or innovative methods and approaches.*

Strengths: Click here to enter text.

Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.

3. Incorporation of Transformative Concepts

The proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts.

Limited Submission Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix

NSF Partnerships for Innovation (PFI)

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

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

4. Project Planning

The plan for carrying out the proposed activities is well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale. The quality of the research plan to translate the existing research discovery to proof-of-concept, prototype or technology scale-up. The plan includes a realistic schedule and a strong strategy for a path towards commercialization. Mechanisms are described to mitigate and deal with potential risks – based on a demonstrated understanding of the technology barrier(s) or knowledge gap(s) and how the proof-of-concept, prototype or technology scale-up has the potential to overcome that gap(s). The effectiveness of the assessment plan and the relevance of the proposer’s metrics to the anticipated results. The quality of the plan for involvement of undergraduate, graduate students and/or post-docs, with the end goal of enhancing their knowledge of innovation.

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

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

5. Qualifications of PI, Team or Organization

The quality and capabilities of the team to successfully complete the project. The technical and commercial strengths and the appropriateness of the proposed partnership(s) and its role in supporting and enabling the objectives of the proposal. The commitment of the proposed partners in reaching the stated goals of the proposal.

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

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

6. Resources

The PI (either at the home organization or through collaborations) has access to adequate resources to carry out the proposed activities.

Limited Submission Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix

NSF Partnerships for Innovation (PFI)

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.](#)

EVALUTATION SCORES

Criteria	Your Score
1. Potential for Advancing Knowledge	
2. Potential for Advancing Societal Outcomes	
3. Incorporation of Transformative Concepts	
4. Project Planning	
5. Qualifications of PI, Team or Organization	
6. Resources	
TOTAL SCORE	