**REP Grant Proposal Scoring Rubric**

**College of Science and Engineering**

Proposal narratives should be written for an audience of Ph.D. mathematicians, scientists, and engineers who are not experts in your specific field of research. Keep in mind that a great proposal will generally receive a higher overall score if the narrative is organized and is comprehensible to all panel members.

Listed within each rubric category or subcategory below is a bulleted list of considerations that will be evaluated by the review panel. Because proposals submitted within the College are diverse, some considerations are not equally applicable to all proposals, making a more detailed point breakdown impractical.

**1. Introduction (10 points)**

* Is there a clear introduction to the general area of research?
* Is the introduction adequately referenced from the professional literature?
* Is the research problem clearly stated?
* Is the motivation for the project clear?

**2. Methodology (25 points)**

2a. Overall Design (10 points)

* Is the overall design sound?
* Can it be reasonably expected to achieve the proposal’s goals?

2b. Design Details (15 points)

* Are the experimental, computational, and/or theoretical details of the proposal clearly presented and are they sound?
* For example, if experimental data will be collected, what is the nature of the raw data, how will it be collected, how will it be analyzed, and what are the analyzed results expected to look like? How will the final results be assessed to verify accuracy, reliability, and/or validity?

**3. Quality of Proposal (55 points)**

3a. Significance to the Field (20 points)

* Is the project likely to result in a significant contribution to the PI’s field of research?

3b. PI and co‐PI Factors (15 points)

* Is the PI’s background sufficient to ensure successful completion of the project?
* The same question applies to the co‐PI, if one is included in the proposal.
* If the PI has received one or more REP grants within the past five years, did those REP grants result in productive scholarly outcomes (e.g., publications, presentations, and/or subsequent submissions of external grant proposals)?
* If a co‐PI is included in the proposal, does the co‐PI have a distinct role and is he/she necessary to ensure success of the project?

3c. Potential for Productive Outcomes (20 points) 1

* Are the required resources available to the investigator(s)?
* Can the project goals be achieved within the time frame of the project?
* If the PI will be working concurrently on another research project, will the PI be able to devote adequate time to this REP project?
* Is the project expected to achieve productive scholarly outcomes?

**4. Budget (10 points)**

4a. Detail (3 points)

* Are all items requested in the budget individually identified?

4b. Justification (7 points)

* Are all items requested in the budget clearly justified?
* If other funding is available for the same project, is the need for additional funding from this REP proposal justified?
* If a co‐PI is included in the proposal, are the distinct roles of the PI and the co‐PI clearly delineated, and are both essential to the success of the project?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1.It is recommended that the following be included in each proposal narrative:

(1) a summary of the availability of required resources that are not listed in the budget request;

(2) a realistic timeline for the project;

(3) a brief realistic statement of projected scholarly outcomes of the proposed project - including potential publications, professional presentations, and/or future submissions of external grant proposals.