Review Criteria for CEI Collaborative Seed Grants

1) Overall Quality of Collaboration & Proposal. (5 points)

The criterion may vary from one proposal to the next, but you should consider the following questions:

- What is the overall **quality** of the proposed science, engineering, or educational plan?
- To what extent is the project a **collaboration** that is greater than the sum of its individual parts?
- Does the proposal go beyond the co-PIs current research into new areas that create a **new and stronger team** effort?

    5: I would argue in front of the group for funding this proposal based on this criterion alone
    4: I would vote to fund this proposal based on this criterion alone
    3: I would need convincing to fund this proposal based on this criterion alone
    2: I would vote against funding this proposal based on this criterion alone
    1: I would argue in front of the group against funding this proposal based on this criterion alone

2) Potential for seeding new future funding. (5 points)

Please evaluate the likelihood that this project will help seed successful future collaborative extramural funding. The criterion may vary from one proposal to the next, but you should consider the following questions:

- What is the **likelihood** that the proposal will lead to significant preliminary results that will justify commitment of significant extramural funds for this research and/or education project?
- Does the proposal demonstrate a strong commitment to submit a major proposal?
- Do the track records of the co-PIs suggest they will follow through on submission of a major proposal based on their preliminary data?
- Critically: have the co-PIs identified at least one specific future funding opportunity(s) and deadline as required by the solicitation?
- Critically: if any of the co-PIs have applied for past CEI seed funding, what was the outcome, and what new proposal submissions did the funding lead to?

    5: I would argue in front of the group for funding this proposal based on this criterion alone
    4: I would vote to fund this proposal based on this criterion alone
    3: I would need convincing to fund this proposal based on this criterion alone
    2: I would vote against funding this proposal based on this criterion alone
    1: I would argue in front of the group against funding this proposal based on this criterion alone

3) Fit to CEI Mission. Please evaluate the fit to the CEI mission areas. (5 points)

Will this proposal support research, education, and/or commercialization programs helping transform UW into a stronger leader in clean energy, either by building on investments in CEI's traditional areas of solar, storage, materials, and grid systems, or to build complementary new areas related to clean energy, sustainability of energy, or especially, concerning community impact (e.g. burden vs. benefit)?

Use the following point scales to evaluate fit to CEI mission:

5: I would argue in front of the group for funding this proposal based on this criterion alone
4: I would vote to fund this proposal based on this criterion alone
3: I would need convincing to fund this proposal based on this criterion alone
2: I would vote against funding this proposal based on this criterion alone
1: I would argue in front of the group against funding this proposal based on this criterion alone

4) Budget. Please comment on the budget and justification. (5 points)

- Is the budget reasonable for the work proposed? (Especially if the PIs asked for the maximum ($100,000) did they explain how they came to this sum?)
- If summer salary, staff, or postdoctoral support is requested, is there a convincing argument why this funding is needed and not better spent on student support that comes with tuition waivers?
- If equipment is requested, is the equipment already available on campus?

Note: Budget should not include requests that include equipment/items for faculty's own labs that are already available in user facilities such as the WCET, MAF, WNF, Chem, etc. Requests for faculty salary support or buyouts should go beyond usual research efforts to support service to the community that might otherwise detract from one's own research or to allow the faculty member to facilitate the submission of a large collaborative grant effort.

Use the following point scales to evaluate budget justification:

5: I would argue in front of the group for funding this proposal based on this criterion alone
4: I would vote to fund this proposal based on this criterion alone
3: I would need convincing to fund this proposal based on this criterion alone
2: I would vote against funding this proposal based on this criterion alone
1: I would argue in front of the group against funding this proposal based on this criterion alone.