

Limited Submission Scoring Matrix

NSF Innovations in Graduate Education (IGE) Program 2019

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 Scoring Matrix NSF Innovations in Graduate Education (IGE) Program 2019

SCORING

Selection of applications to be submitted to the **NSF Innovations in Graduate Education (IGE) 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 Scoring Matrix NSF Innovations in Graduate Education (IGE) Program 2019

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:

| |
|---|
| <p>1. Potential for Advancing Knowledge What is the potential for the proposed activity to advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields (Intellectual Merit)? All NSF projects should be of the highest quality and have the potential to advance, if not transform, the frontiers of knowledge.</p> |
| <p>Strengths:</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> |
| <p>2. Potential for Advancing Societal Outcomes What is the potential for the proposed activity to benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes (Broader Impacts)? 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, but in either case must be well justified.</p> |
| <p>Strengths:</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> |
| <p>3. Incorporation of Transformative Concepts To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts?</p> |
| <p>Strengths:</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> |

Limited Submission Scoring Matrix
NSF Innovations in Graduate Education (IGE) Program 2019

| |
|--|
| 4. Project Planning Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success? |
| Strengths: |
| Weaknesses: |
| 5. Qualifications of PI, Team or Organization How well qualified is the individual, team, or organization to conduct the proposed activities? |
| Strengths: |
| Weaknesses: |
| 6. Resources Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home organization or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities? |
| Strengths: |
| Weaknesses: |

ADDITIONAL SOLICITATION-SPECIFIC REVIEW CRITERIA

| |
|--|
| 7. Evaluation & Assessment Is there a well-conceived plan, including tangible metrics aligned with the goals and pilot timeline, to evaluate the outcomes of the proposed project? The assessment should be aimed at gathering the student-based data needed to test the hypothesis. |
| Strengths: |
| Weaknesses: |

Limited Submission Scoring Matrix
NSF Innovations in Graduate Education (IGE) Program 2019

| |
|---|
| |
| 8. STEM Education, Disciplinary, Interdisciplinary, & Workforce Needs Does the proposal adequately identify the intended contribution(s) of the IGE project to STEM education, disciplinary/interdisciplinary and/or workforce needs? For example, is it aimed at a need in a single discipline or is it targeting skillsets in response to interdisciplinary research? Does the proposal ground the identified need in the literature? |
| Strengths: |
| Weaknesses: |
| 9. Knowledge Generation To what extent would the project generate the knowledge needed to inform implementation and adaptability of potentially transformative improvements to graduate education? |
| Strengths: |
| Weaknesses: |

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO APPLICANT

Reviewers may provide guidance to the applicant or recommend against submission without fundamental revision.

| |
|---|
| Additional Comments to Applicants (Optional) |
| |

Limited Submission Scoring Matrix
NSF Innovations in Graduate Education (IGE) Program 2019
Evaluation 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 | |
| 7. Evaluation & Assessment | |
| 8. STEM Education, Disciplinary, Interdisciplinary, & Workforce Needs | |
| 9. Knowledge Generation | |
| TOTAL SCORE | |