APPENDIX
Rating Factors for CRIS RFP

INTELLECTUAL MERIT: (vis-à-vis NSF Science & Technology Centers)

Criterion One: Scientific Strength of the Proposed Project
1. Project plan shows no promise of significant scientific contribution
2. Plan shows some merit, but aspects of the project plan are unclear or weak relative to other CRIS projects
3. Plan shows significant promise for leading to results that will be publishable in a peer-reviewed medium
4. Proposed work is innovative and shows promise of gaining the attention of those working in the area
5. Proposed work is highly innovative and has potential for having a ground-breaking impact in its field

Criterion Two: Centrality of Project to CRIS’s Mission
1. Project goals appear unrelated to those of CRIS
2. Project involves some aspect of evolution, but does not relate strongly to the CRIS mission
3. Project has relevance to CRIS’ mission
4. Project aligns with CRIS mission and shows promise of opening new areas for multidisciplinary investigation
5. Project is critical to CRIS’ future success and shows promise of leading to many future collaborations

Criterion Three: Quality of Plan for Obtaining External Funding
1. No plan for obtaining external funding, nor sufficient material to produce a proposal
2. Project likely to produce some preliminary data useful for proposals, but no plans are mentioned
3. Project likely to produce good preliminary data; vague details or rationale for external funding provided, but no specific plans
4. Project likely to produce good preliminary data; details provided for obtaining external funding (such as specific and appropriate programs)
5. Project likely to produce good preliminary data; a clear and compelling plan for obtaining external funding

BROADER IMPACTS:

Criterion Four: Knowledge Transfer to Industry
1. Project shows no likelihood of producing results of value to industry
2. Project shows some likelihood of producing results that might eventually be of value to industry
3. Project shows promise of producing results in an area of expressed interest to industry
4. Project appears to offer promise of providing results that are of immediate value to industry
5. Project is organized around solution of a problem identified by a particular company/group of companies as important to them

Criterion Five: Budget Appropriateness
1. Project budget includes costs not allowed by national granting agencies (such as personal laptops or other expenses that should be paid for by overhead) -or- has large costs where no justification is provided or obvious
2. Project budget has weak justification and appears much larger than necessary -or- budget is so large that it clearly goes beyond the scope of seed funding or reasonable infrastructure expenditures
3. Project budget is in line with seed funding goals, but may not represent a good return on investment
4. Project budget represents a good investment of CRIS funds
5. Project budget represents an exceptional investment of CRIS funds

Criterion Six: Overall Quality
1. Poor
2. Fair
3. Good
4. Very Good
5. Excellent