



2023 Advanced Collaboration Grant (Cycle 2) – Reviewer Scorecard
for collaborative applied research within the five “WE CAN” resilience sectors

Project: _____

Applicant Organization: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Reviewer’s Name

Reviewer’s
Overall Score

Screening Criteria

- Received ≤ 2-page LOI (10/17/2023, 11:59 PM EST)
- Received full proposal by deadline (11/28/2023, 11:59 PM EST)
- Organization based in South Carolina
- Registered with SC Secretary of State (businesses only)
- Principal investigator is both a SC resident and either a US Citizen or a permanent resident
- Completion of required application materials (A-G, including letters of collaboration, plus appendices)
- Page length (max 2 pages for section C and max 10 pages for section G)
- Requested funding ≤ \$100,000
- Project length ≤ 12 months
- No active Advanced Collaboration grant
- 3 or more partner organizations
- Self-certification
- Included 1 or more resilience sectors
- No ineligible expenses*

* Ineligible expenses include rent, international travel, licensing fees, legal fees, reimbursement of past expenses, indirect costs, profit, and general-purpose equipment such as desktop workstations, office furnishings, or reproduction and printing equipment.

Criteria	Reviewer Comments <i>Provide comments to help applicants identify opportunities to improve when re-applying</i>		Scoring Rubric <i>Select the point category that most aligns with your review of the application material. Scores can fall within point categories (ex. 12 points)</i>			
	Strengths	Weaknesses	0 points	10 points	15 points	20 points
<p>#1. Alignment to CORE SC & Vision 2030</p> <p>The applicant clearly described the proposed collaborative research project, as well as its goals, objectives, and data-driven performance outcomes.</p> <p>The applicant directly addresses how the project will advance a solution in one or more of CORE SC's five resilience sectors (water, energy, connectivity, agriculture, and natural hazards)</p> <p>The applicant directly addresses how the project will advance one or more of the Vision 2030 goal areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High-tech Industrial Growth - Innovation & Entrepreneurship - Research Competitiveness - K-20 STEM Education 			<p>The applicant did not directly address how the project advances at least one CORE SC resilience sector and at least one Vision 2030 goal area <i>or</i> did not provide a clear description of the project, goals, and objectives</p>	<p>The applicant directly addressed how the project advances at least one CORE SC resilience sector and at least one Vision 2030 goal area <i>but</i> did not provide a clear description of the project, goals, and objectives</p>	<p>The applicant directly addressed at least one CORE SC resilience sector and at least one Vision 2030 goal area <i>and</i> provided a clear description of the project, goals, and objectives <i>but</i> did not include data-driven performance outcomes</p>	<p>The applicant directly addressed at least one CORE SC resilience sector and at least one Vision 2030 goal area <i>and</i> provided a clear description of the project, goals, and objectives <i>and</i> included data-driven performance outcomes</p>

Criteria	Reviewer Comments <i>Provide comments to help applicants identify opportunities to improve when re-applying</i>		Scoring Rubric <i>Select the point category that most aligns with your review of the application material. Scores can fall within point categories (ex. 12 points)</i>			
#2. Method/Approach The applicant provides a clear rationale for the project design and addresses any applicable compliance issues.	Strengths	Weaknesses	0 points	5 points	10 points	15 points
	The applicant <i>did not</i> provide a clear rationale for the project design	The applicant provided a clear rationale for the project design <i>but</i> did not address potential compliance issues	The applicant provided a clear rationale for the project design <i>and</i> addressed compliance issues <i>but</i> unresolved questions remain	The applicant provided a clear rationale for the project design <i>and</i> addressed compliance issues with no unresolved questions or did not appear to have any compliance issues		

Criteria	Reviewer Comments <i>Provide comments to help applicants identify opportunities to improve when re-applying</i>		Scoring Rubric <i>Select the point category that most aligns with your review of the application material. Scores can fall within point categories (ex. 12 points)</i>			
#3. Partnerships & Equitability	Strengths	Weaknesses	0 points	5 points	10 points	15 points
<p>The applicant demonstrated partnerships or cooperative arrangements with three or more subject-matter experts among academia (including colleges and universities, historically black colleges and universities, technical colleges, and high schools), government agencies, business and industry, private research foundations, and minority-serving institutions.</p> <p>The project team included members from underrepresented or underserved groups.</p>			<p>The applicant <i>did not</i> demonstrate evidence of any strong partnerships with subject-matter experts</p>	<p>The applicant demonstrated <i>some</i> evidence of strong partnerships with subject-matter experts</p>	<p>The applicant demonstrated <i>strong</i> evidence of partnerships with subject-matter experts</p>	<p>The applicant demonstrated strong evidence of partnerships with subject-matter experts <i>and</i> their team included members from under-represented or underserved groups</p>

Criteria	Reviewer Comments <i>Provide comments to help applicants identify opportunities to improve when re-applying</i>		Scoring Rubric <i>Select the point category that most aligns with your review of the application material. Scores can fall within point categories (ex. 12 points)</i>			
<p>#4. Anticipated Impacts</p> <p>The applicant demonstrated a high probability for successful implementation within the proposed schedule and has the potential to generate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Useful data for NASA and other supporting organizations - Publishable research findings or solutions <p>The applicant demonstrated the scalability or replicability of the collaborative research project.</p> <p>The collaborative research project has the potential for use by industry and to create jobs.</p>	Strengths	Weaknesses	0 points	5 points	10 points	15 points
	<p>The applicant <i>did not</i> address the anticipated impacts of the project</p>	<p>The applicant demonstrated only <i>one</i> of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> useable outcomes (data or research) <i>or</i> scalability/replicability <i>or</i> economic and workforce development 	<p>The applicant demonstrated <i>two</i> of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> useable outcomes (data or research) <i>or</i> scalability/replicability <i>or</i> economic and workforce development 	<p>The applicant demonstrated all <i>three</i> of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> useable outcomes (data or research) <i>and</i> scalability/replicability <i>and</i> economic and workforce development 		

Criteria	Reviewer Comments <i>Provide comments to help applicants identify opportunities to improve when re-applying</i>		Scoring Rubric <i>Select the point category that most aligns with your review of the application material. Scores can fall within point categories (ex. 12 points)</i>			
<p>#5. Project Management</p> <p>The applicant demonstrated an effective project management structure, and the team members have sufficient experience for completion of the proposed project.</p> <p>The applicant clearly identified anticipated barriers to project completion and strategies to manage the associated risk.</p>	Strengths	Weaknesses	5 points	10 points	15 points	20 points
	The applicant <i>did not</i> demonstrate an effective team structure or the sufficiency of their team members	The applicant demonstrated an effective team structure and the sufficiency of their team members <i>but</i> did not identify anticipated barriers	The applicant demonstrated an effective team structure, the sufficiency of their team members, and anticipated barriers <i>but</i> did not have a strategy for managing risk	The applicant demonstrated an effective team structure, the sufficiency of their team members, and anticipated barriers <i>and</i> did have a strategy for managing risk		

Criteria	Reviewer Comments <i>Provide comments to help applicants identify opportunities to improve when re-applying</i>		Scoring Rubric <i>Select the point category that most aligns with your review of the application material. Scores can fall within point categories (ex. 12 points)</i>			
#6. Budget The applicant provided a complete and clear budget form and a detailed break-down of how the funds will be used. The funding request is reasonable, and the budget is adequate for the proposed tasks.	Strengths	Weaknesses	0 points	5 points	10 points	15 points
			The applicant <i>did not</i> provide a complete budget form	The applicant provided a complete budget form <i>but</i> did not provide a budget justification narrative	The applicant provided a complete budget form and budget justification <i>but</i> the budget the reasonability of the budget was questionable or the justification was limited	The applicant provided a complete, reasonable budget form <i>and</i> a strong budget justification narrative