Limited Submission Scoring Matrix
NIH Science Education Partnership Award (SEPA) (R25) 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 (ranging from one to five pages, depending on the type of program and sponsor) 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.

UTSA
Knowledge Enterprise

Limited Submission Scoring Matrix
NIH Science Education Partnership Award (SEPA) (R25) Program

SCORING

Selection of applications to be submitted to the **NIH Science Education Partnership Award (SEPA) (R25) Program** will be based on a 9-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

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

UTSA
Knowledge Enterprise

Limited Submission Scoring Matrix
NIH Science Education Partnership Award (SEPA) (R25) Program

SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA

Reviewers will consider each of the 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:

---

1. Significance

Does the proposed program address a key audience and an important aspect or important need in research education? Is there convincing evidence in the application that the proposed program will significantly advance the stated goal of the program?

How will implementation of the proposed program encourage students from underserved communities to consider careers in health and medicine? How will implementation of the proposed program advance NIH workforce development objectives? Will this project generate resources that will increase career opportunities for underrepresented minorities and women, groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM fields, improve Teacher effectiveness through professional development and advance the field of evidence-based STEM education practices?

Strengths: Click here to enter text.

Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.

---

2. Investigator(s)

Is the PD/PI capable of providing both administrative and scientific leadership to the development and implementation of the proposed program? If applicable, is there evidence that the participating faculty have experience in mentoring students and teaching science? If the project is collaborative or multi-PD/PI, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise?

If it is appropriate for the proposed project, does the key personnel group include role models or near-peer mentors of age, gender, race or ethnicity similar to the target audience(s)?

Strengths: Click here to enter text.

Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.

3. Innovation

Taking into consideration the nature of the proposed research education program, does the applicant make a strong case for this program effectively reaching an audience in need of the program's offerings? Where appropriate, is the proposed program developing or utilizing innovative approaches and latest best practices to improve the knowledge and/or skills of the intended audience?

Is the proposed research education program characterized by innovation and scholarship? Does the proposed program challenge current research education paradigms or address an innovative hypothesis and critical barrier to progress in the STEM field? Is a clear case made for the proposed innovation? Is a clear case made for using current, well-tested techniques to develop and implement the proposed project?

Strengths: Click here to enter text.

Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.

4. Approach

Does the proposed program clearly state its goals and objectives, including the educational level of the audience to be reached, the content to be conveyed, and the intended outcome? Is there evidence that the program is based on a sound rationale, as well as sound educational concepts and principles?

Is the project design culturally relevant to the target audience? Is there input from the Teachers, parents, community and other stakeholders that will generate buy-in and ownership? If appropriate for the proposed project, is the plan for Teacher professional development in science content and pedagogical skills, both pre-service and as a continuing education process for in-service Teachers, well described? Does the content of the proposed project align with the Next Generation Science Standards? If appropriate is there a plan for a public outreach component?

Strengths: Click here to enter text.

Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.

5. Approach: Evaluation Plan

Does the evaluation staff have the appropriate training and experience in evaluation methodology to conduct the proposed evaluation plan? Is there a discussion of the selection and appropriateness of control groups? If applicable, are the plans for obtaining feedback from participants adequate to measure the quality and effectiveness of the proposed preK-12 STEM project?

UTSA
Knowledge Enterprise

Limited Submission Scoring Matrix
NIH Science Education Partnership Award (SEPA) (R25) Program

Strengths: Click here to enter text.

Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.

---

6. Approach: Dissemination Plan

Is the dissemination plan well-designed and appropriate for the materials that will be created? Do the PD(s)/PI(s) discuss plans for posters, presentations, workshops and other dissemination practices at local, regional and national conferences? Are there plans to utilize cutting-edge social media venues such as Wikis, YouTube, Facebook, etc.?

Strengths: Click here to enter text.

Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.

---

7. Environment

Will the scientific and educational environment of the proposed program contribute to its intended goals? Is there a plan to take advantage of this environment to enhance the educational value of the program?

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 resubmission without fundamental revision.

Additional Comments to Applicants (Optional)

UTSA
Knowledge Enterprise

Limited Submission Scoring Matrix
NIH Science Education Partnership Award (SEPA) (R25) Program

Click here to enter text.

EVALUATION SCORES

Criteria	Your Score
1. Significance	
2. Investigator(s)	
3. Innovation	
4. Approach	
5. Approach: Evaluation Plan	
6. Approach: Dissemination Plan	
7. Environment	
TOTAL SCORE	

UTSA
Knowledge Enterprise