

Limited Submission Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (DHSI) 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.

Limited Submission Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (DHSI) Program

SCORING

Selection of applications to be submitted to the Department of Education’s **Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (DHSI) 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: 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	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 Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (DHSI) Program

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 review criteria below.

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

<p>1. Quality of the applicant’s comprehensive development plan (25 pts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(1) The strengths, weaknesses, and significant problems of the institution’s academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability are clearly and comprehensively analyzed and result from a process that involved major constituencies of the institution; (5 pts)(2) The goals for the institution’s academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability are realistic and based on comprehensive analysis; (5 pts)(3) The objectives stated in the plan are measurable, related to institutional goals, and, if achieved, will contribute to the growth and self-sufficiency of the institution; and (5 pts)(4) The plan clearly and comprehensively describes the methods and resources the institution will use to institutionalize practice and improvements developed under the proposed project, including, in particular, how operational costs for personnel, maintenance, and upgrades of equipment will be paid with institutional resources. (5 pts)(5) The plan clearly and comprehensively describes the five-year plan to improve its services to Hispanic and other low-income students. (5 pts)
<p>Strengths: Click here to enter text.</p> <p>Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>2. Quality of the project design (15 pts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale. (5 pts)(2) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by promising evidence. (10 pts)
<p>Strengths: Click here to enter text.</p> <p>Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>3. Quality of activity objectives (10 pts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(1) Realistic and defined in terms of measurable results; (5 pts)(2) Directly related to the problems to be solved and to the goals of the comprehensive development plan. (5 pts)

Limited Submission Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (DHSI) Program

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

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

4. Quality of implementation strategy (15 pts)

- (1) The implementation strategy for each activity is comprehensive; (5 pts)
- (2) The rationale for the implementation strategy for each activity is clearly described and is supported by the results of relevant studies or projects; (5 pts)
- (3) The timetable for each activity is realistic and likely to be attained. (5 pts)

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

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

5. Quality of project management plan (10 pts)

- (1) Procedures for managing the project are likely to ensure efficient and effective project implementation; (5 pts)
- (2) The project coordinator and activity directors have sufficient authority to conduct the project effectively, including access to the president or chief executive officer. (5 pts)

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

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

6. Quality of key personnel (10 pts)

- (1) The past experience and training of key professional personnel are directly related to the stated activity objectives; (5 pts)
- (2) The time commitment of key personnel is realistic. (5 pts)

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

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

7. Quality of evaluation plan (15 pts)

- (1) The data elements and the data collection procedures are clearly described and appropriate to measure the attainment of activity objectives and to measure the success of the project in achieving the goals of the comprehensive development plan; (5 pts)



Limited Submission Review Instructions & Scoring Matrix Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (DHSI) Program

(2) The data analysis procedures are clearly described and are likely to produce formative and summative results on attaining activity objectives and measuring the success of the project on achieving the goals of the comprehensive development plan; (5 pts)
 (3) The evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings. (5 pts)

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. Quality of the applicant's comprehensive development plan	/25
2. Quality of the project design	/15
3. Quality of activity objectives	/10
4. Quality of implementation strategy	/15
5. Quality of project management plan	/10
6. Quality of key personnel	/10
7. Quality of evaluation plan	/15
TOTAL SCORE	/100