SURPASS PROGRAM
FULL PROPOSAL REVIEW CRITERIA

Date: 1/16/2024

REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS
Proposals will be reviewed by a selection team from WSE and APL, including independent subject matter experts. Proposals will be evaluated on the criteria and sub-criteria outlined in this document, as well as strategic considerations from senior WSE and APL leadership. Reviewers are not at liberty to comment on your proposal before submission.

POINT DISTRIBUTION SUMMARY

New proposals and continuing proposals
Criterion 1: Technical Approach (total 12 points)
- Sub-criterion 1.1: Scope and impact (4 points)
- Sub-criterion 1.2: Innovativeness (4 points)
- Sub-criterion 1.3: Technical challenge (4 points)
Criterion 2: Collaboration Plan (4 points x 2 = total 8 points)
Criterion 3: Future Funding Consideration (4 points x 3 = total 12 points)
Criterion 4: Project Budget and Budget Realism (4 points x 2 = total 8 points)

Maximum total score for new proposals: 40 points

Continuing proposals only
Criterion 5: Currently Funded SURPASS Efforts (4 points x 2 = total 8 points)

Maximum total score for continuing proposals: 48 points*

*This score will be proportionally scaled to 40 points for comparison to new proposals.

The details of how these criteria and sub-criteria will be evaluated as well as which proposal sections will be considered for each follows.

CRITERION 1: TECHNICAL APPROACH (TOTAL 12 POINTS)

Relevant proposal sections:
- Overview/background
- Technical Approach
  - Innovativeness
  - Technical challenge
  - Risk Identification and Mitigation
- Quad Chart
- Technical appendix: CV/Biosketch
- Technical appendix: Bibliography

Indicate how well the proposal accomplishes the goal statements in each sub-criterion.
(1) Underwhelming (2) Meets expectations (3) Above expectations (4) Exceptional
The sum total of the sub-criteria scores will be the score for Criterion 1: Technical Approach.

Sub-criterion: Scope and Impact (4 points)
- The proposal convincingly outlined how their approach will solve their problem for a well-defined set of users and unmet need.
- The authors clearly indicated how they will differentiate themselves from their competition.
• This proposal will have a broad global impact in that it will position JHU as a global leader.
  Sub-criterion: Innovativeness (4 points)
  ● The authors adequately justified why their ideas are ambitious “big bets.”
  ● This proposal idea will fundamentally transform the field within the next decade.
  ● This proposal idea is a truly revolutionary innovation that takes advantage of/responds to disruptive opportunities (or counters such disruption).

Sub-criterion: Technical challenge (4 points)
  ● Through this proposal approach, researchers will be discovering enabling techniques or experimental approaches, not merely applying existing technology or experimental approaches in a new way.
  ● The researchers are employing technically valid means for solving the problem and leveraging valid, field-specific trends and practices.
  ● The proposal adequately describes how the authors will mitigate risk and know when they need to pivot their research direction.

CRITERION 2: COLLABORATION PLAN (4 POINTS X 2 = TOTAL 8 POINTS)
Relevant proposal sections:
  ● Collaboration Plan
  ● WSE/APL Integrated Milestone Schedule
  ● Technical appendix: CV/Biosketch

Indicate how well the proposal accomplishes the goal statements in this criterion.
  (1) Underwhelming (2) Meets expectations (3) Above expectations (4) Exceptional
The score out of 4 points will be doubled to calculate the total score for Criterion 2: Collaboration Plan.

  ● The proposal clearly leverages unique strengths in a powerfully interdisciplinary way.
  ● The proposal convincingly explains how the collaborators are the right team to solve this problem.
  ● The proposal adequately outlines how the researchers will satisfy team member publication goals and equipment usage needs.
  ● The proposal adequately outlines how the team will share data through the interdivisional collaboration.
  ● The proposal adequately outlines how the researchers will make their vision a reality through sufficient milestones and expected achievements.

CRITERION 3: FUTURE FUNDING CONSIDERATION (4 POINTS X 3 = TOTAL 12 POINTS)
Relevant proposal sections:
  ● Future Funding Considerations
  ● Quad chart
Indicate how well the proposal accomplishes the goal statements in this criterion.

(1) Underwhelming (2) Meets expectations (3) Above expectations (4) Exceptional

The score out of 4 points will be tripled to calculate the total score for Criterion 3: Future Funding Consideration.

- The authors have comprehensively described how this proposed research aligns with known or expected USGOV, commercial sector needs, and/or international needs.
- The proposal clearly outlines how the authors have assessed and evaluated the opportunities for future funding.
- The proposal sufficiently justifies how this proposal has potential to attain funds in the $100M domain.
- For currently funded teams, also consider how the team has actively sought and/or made inroads with external sponsors/stakeholders. Example progress might include: phone/Zoom briefings with sponsors, sponsor visits, whitepaper submitted, received whitepaper feedback, received sponsor request for full proposal, received notification of intent to award, negotiating contract, executed a contract.

CRITERION 4: PROJECT BUDGET AND BUDGET REALISM (4 POINTS X 2 = TOTAL 8 POINTS)

Relevant proposal sections:

- Technical volume
- WSE budget volume
- APL budget volume

Indicate how well the proposal accomplishes the goal statements in this criterion.

(1) Underwhelming (2) Meets expectations (3) Above expectations (4) Exceptional

The score out of 4 points will be doubled to calculate the total score for Criterion 4: Project Budget and Budget Realism.

- The proposed budget is appropriate for what the authors propose to accomplish in 18-months.
- The proposed budget correlates with the expected effort for each of the contributors.

CRITERION 5: CURRENTLY FUNDED SURPASS EFFORTS (4 POINTS X 2 = TOTAL 8 POINTS)

Relevant proposal sections:

- Technical volume for currently funded SURPASS proposals only

Indicate how well the proposal accomplishes the goal statements in this criterion.

(1) Underwhelming (2) Meets expectations (3) Above expectations (4) Exceptional

The score out of 4 points will be doubled to calculate the total score for Criterion 5: Currently funded SURPASS efforts.
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- Technical progress: The team is making technical progress appropriate for 12-months of effort.
- Competent progress: The team is progressing competently toward their initially proposed vision. The proposed milestones may have changed, but team should still be making progress (i.e., they have found another way if necessary).

INNOVATION DEVELOPMENT CANVAS
The innovation development canvas (IDC) will not be reviewed by the reviewers, but it is a requirement of the submission package. Failure to submit a completed IDC for your project will result in an immediate disqualification.