

Collaboration Fund Proposal Evaluation Rubric - Center for Advanced Energy Studies

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Proposal Novelty & Impact: A strong case is made for the novelty and importance of the proposal topic. Problem statement or topic question is clearly articulated.	Excellent: Proposed topic is highly original. Results are expected to be impactful in the identified focus area. Problem statement or topic question is clearly articulated.	Good: Proposed topic is novel and the work described is interesting. Includes some impact to focus area. Problem statement or topic question is articulated.	Fair: Proposed topic demonstrates some potential for impact, but is negligible. Problem statement or topic question is not clearly stated.	Poor: Proposed work is unoriginal and demonstrates little to no potential impact. Fails to provide meaningful problem statement or topic question.
Methodology & Conceptual Framework: Proposal includes a specific and well defined plan for carrying out the scope. Perceived challenges are addressed and articulated as needed.	Excellent: Methods and framework are communicated clearly. Perceived challenges are addressed and alternatives are provided as needed.	Good: Methods and framework are well communicated and reasonable. Some risks or challenges are identified as needed.	Fair: Methods and framework are communicated but are difficult to understand; mostly reasonable. Minor concerns over feasibility and scope of proposal.	Poor: Methods or framework are not clearly communicated and/or they are not reasonable.
INL/CAES Collaboration: Proposal demonstrates meaningful collaboration between INL and CAES universities; roles and expectations are clearly defined.	Excellent: Proposal demonstrates complementary expertise. Roles and expectations are clearly defined. Collaboration is meaningful and supports further engagement opportunities.	Good: Proposal demonstrates meaningful collaboration between INL and CAES universities. Roles and expectations have been defined.	Fair: Proposal demonstrates some meaningful collaboration between INL and CAES universities. Roles and expectations have some definition.	Poor: Proposal demonstrates no meaningful collaboration between INL and CAES universities. Roles and expectations have not been defined. Future engagement unlikely.
Proposed Outcomes: Proposal outcomes provide value to each stakeholder. Demonstrates potential for return on investment/furthering mission of CAES/INL.	Excellent: Proposal outcome is clearly stated/demonstrates value to the potential stakeholders. Demonstrates strong potential for return on investment/furthering of CAES/INL mission.	Good: Proposal outcome demonstrates adequate value to the potential stakeholders involved. Demonstrates potential for return on investment/furthering mission of CAES/INL mission.	Fair: Proposal outcome is stated and demonstrates some value to the potential stakeholders involved. Demonstrates some potential for return on investment.	Poor: Proposal outcome is not stated. Demonstrates no additional value to the potential stakeholders involved or CAES/INL mission.
Deliverables/Milestones: Proposal deliverables and milestones are clearly defined and commensurate of funding value. Scope is reasonable and justified in the timeline provided.	Excellent: Deliverables and milestones are clearly defined and commensurate of funding value. Deliverables and timeline are appropriate for the type of work being performed.	Good: Deliverables and milestones are defined and commensurate of funding value. Deliverables and timeline are appropriate for the type of work being performed.	Fair: Some deliverables and milestones are defined. Funding value may not be commensurate with deliverables. Deliverables and timeline are somewhat appropriate for the type of work being performed.	Poor: Deliverables and milestones have not been defined. Value of proposal funds requested not commensurate to deliverable. Timeline not feasible for they type of work being performed.

Reviewer Check:

- Timeline is clear and reasonable
 Budget is detailed and justified for the proposed work
 Topic is aligned with CAES/INL mission, strategy, and focus areas.

Reviewer Name:

Review Date:

Rubric Score: /20

CAES Collaboration Fund Proposal Overview & Style Guidelines

The Center for Advanced Energy Studies (CAES) is a research, education, and innovation consortium between Idaho National Laboratory (INL), Boise State University (BSU), Idaho State University (ISU), and University of Idaho (UI).

CAES Collaboration Funds are designed to bring Idaho National Laboratory (INL) researchers and CAES university members together to build new relationships and develop joint-funded research programs. Along with growing external funding in the seven CAES focus areas, Collaboration Funds aim to support the strategies and missions of CAES and INL.

Eligible applicants:

INL staff may serve as the Principal Investigator (PI) with a CAES university collaborator Co-PI. Proposals should be submitted by the INL PI.

Proposal Details:

**Collaboration Fund proposals should be written for a non-technical & interdisciplinary audience. Reviewers may not have expertise in your area of research. Proposal descriptions should be well-written and thorough. Technical narratives may be attached as an appendix for review.

For each proposal: describe your topic in detail, the information you are collecting, how you will collect it, and how your time will be utilized.

Proposal Requirements:

- Proposal body should be 500 words or less. (Budget justification, timeline, technical narratives may be provided as an attachment.)
- Page Header: Full name, Organization, Title of Proposal
- **Title and Abstract:** When submitting, you will be asked to enter a title and abstract for your proposal. Abstracts should be 2-3 sentences, provide a clear overview of the purpose, plan, and intended outcome of the proposed project. Abstracts should be non-technical and written for audiences outside of your research area/expertise.

- **Proposal Novelty/Impact:** Provide an explanation of how your proposed work is original (or builds upon other work) and has a high potential for impact – impacts may be broader than specific focus area. Explain value and impacts to a non-technical audience unfamiliar with your discipline.
- **Work Plan/Methods:** Provide the specific work plan for implementation of the proposal. Ensure the scope is reasonable and justified in the provided timeline. Consider outlining potential challenges/setbacks, and provide alternate options (as needed).
- **Timeline:** Provide a timeline of your proposed process, highlighting your ability to complete your topic within an appropriate and reasonable time frame.
- **Milestones/Deliverables:** Provide concrete deliverables tied to your proposal work that are commensurate of the funding requested. Examples of deliverables include: meeting notes, literature reviews, white papers, concept papers, workshop materials, etc.
- **Budget Justification:** Provide rationale for your budget justification. The budget should be detailed and well-reasoned to show the reviewers why the provided funds are needed to support your proposal. Use calculations to explain budget requirements and estimations of cost. (Example: Graduate Student Labor for Literature Review \$50/hr, 40 hours, plus fringe and overhead cost (each cost should be broken out by line item.)

Associate Lab Director/Associate Director/Manager Endorsement:

It is your responsibility to get support for your proposal from each of the referenced individuals.

Programmatic Development (PD) Fund Budget Usage Guidelines: Be sure to follow PD guidelines for budget usage summarized below.

- PD funds can be used for the following:
 - Labor costs for individuals working on activities specifically directed at the development of new collaboration (e.g., initiative planning, proposal development time, graphics, technical writing, and editing)
 - Development of concept papers, strategy, or documentation
 - Cost associated with targeted market research to obtain a better understanding of current or potential customer needs that will then be factored into strategy or business plans

- Costs associated for travel for discussion with customers or potential customers to develop/define work scope and identify funding for new programs **(limited by COVID travel restrictions)**
- Travel and labor to a symposium/conference/workshop provided recipient is (1) presenting/hosting CAES research and capabilities or (2) manning booths **(limited by COVID travel restrictions)**
- CAES Collaboration Funds may not be used to co-mingle with Direct-funded INL Programs or LDRD-funded projects.
- Funds may not be used to collect data or perform R&D experimental activities.

For additional questions or information, please see the following for contact information:

Amy Woodard, *CAES Business Operations Lead*

Email: amy.woodard@inl.gov