UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED, LIMITED SUBMISSIONS PROCESS

Opportunity Search and Launching in InfoReady (Competition Space)

Limited submission opportunities are screened on a continual basis throughout the year, utilizing multiple sources. Unless there is a short turnaround on deadlines, these competitions are generally grouped together monthly for campus-wide announcement via campus listserv. In the event of short turnarounds, separate announcements are sent out.

- Initiate queries in PIVOT to target funding opportunities that limit number of possible applicants per university;

- Create PIVOT alerts to be notified when such opportunities are publicly released/posted; receive weekly updates

- Identify other potential opportunities via listservs, websites, newsletters, email updates—ongoing basis

- Once an opportunity deadline is confirmed, read through the eligibility requirements and program funding priorities to determine if we need to post; liaise with Sponsored Research for eligibility issues if necessary

- Create and launch individual postings for each opportunity in the InfoReady internal competition web portal:
  - Set internal deadlines; If there is time, allow at least 2 weeks for internal review panel, 1 week for dean review
  - Set PI notification dates; Aim for PI notification at least 1 month prior to agency deadline, or more if time allows (less if time is short)
  - Upload internal application process PDF file into the posting
  - Upload RFA and any other pertinent information (Q&A, webinar notifications, etc)
  - Upload internal requirements for each posting (documents required for upload by applicants, or any special instructions (such as documented cost-share)

- Launches are grouped together for monthly campus announcement; if any specific opportunity has a short timeline between release and sponsor due date, we launch it separately with its own separate announcement

- Create email announcements for campus listserv; campus announcement includes links to the web portal, as well as internal and sponsor deadlines associated with each funding opportunity

Post InfoReady Launch and Review Process

Once the internal competition deadline has passed, The Office of Research Development (ORD) will review each component of the internal application to ensure completeness. If so, then the internal application is 'accepted' via the InfoReady software. Regardless of one application or more than one application, each proposal is assigned to the applicant's respective Dean or ORU Director for review, rating, and comments. It is anticipated that each Dean and/or ORU director will solicit input from appropriate faculty in evaluating the merits of the limited submission proposal. This level of review should consider the alignment of the proposal with the strategic research vision of the School or the ORU.

If Dean or ORU Director-approved and only one application is received, then the applicant is deemed the 'awardee'. ORD sends the awardee an email notification, including our Sponsored Research Services Office. SRS is copied so they are aware that the aforementioned awardee is the only authorized and designated proposal to move forward from the university.

If approved by their respective Dean or ORU Director, and there is more than the allotted application allowance, then an ad hoc review committee is convened. ORD does due diligence in noting conflict of interest as well as finding appropriate and amenable reviewers within the research area of the proposal. Amenable ad hoc reviewers are instructed to review the applications in InfoReady, rate, and provide comments. If the Dean/ORU Director is the PI/applicant, the VCORED should select a qualified member of the faculty (e.g. ORU director can be chosen to review a dean's proposal and a dean can be chosen to review an ORU director's proposal) to conduct the review.

Reviewers are asked to provide rankings based on the review criteria and comments in support of each proposal nomination, describing the strengths and weakness of the proposal. Typically, the reviewers consider such factors as: i) the strength of the research team, ii) the feasibility of the research, iii) the fit of the proposed activity to the RFA, and iv) probability of the proposed activity of success in the competition in question. A review rubric can be found on the InfoReady website [and end of this document].

In the event that the limited submission opportunity involves mandatory cost sharing, the utilization of space not currently occupied by the PI or ongoing support and maintenance of a new instrument or facilities, approval for the use of such resources must be identified at the preproposal stage. All parties involved are expected to contribute to any mandatory cost sharing

Once all the reviewer scores are submitted, then email notifications are sent to all applicants. Again, ORD sends the awardee an email notification, including our Sponsored Research Services Office. SRS is copied so they are aware that the aforementioned awardee is the only authorized and designated proposal to move forward from the university. Note, 'rejectee' email notifications are only sent to the internal applicant; no other office is notified. All applicants are also notified of their relative scores, and they are provided access to written review comments if available.

For opportunities that have 0 applicants, ORD will re-announce these opportunities again. In such cases, applicants should only submit their proposed budgets, space requirements, and cost-sharing needs. If the campus does not have the capacity to support the work proposed by the applicant, then the applicant should not move forward with submitting a full proposal. (see extended opportunities language below)

> ### *Language for Extended Opportunities Announcement*
> *The following limited submission opportunities were previously announced and may remain open for applicants with expedited internal deadline. Interested applicants must contact the Office of Research Development for approval if considering applying. Such requests are granted on first-come first-serve basis, or may be denied. Please contact the Office of Research Development if you are interested in applying to any of the following in order to determine current eligibility and/or availability: [insert opportunities below].*

Rubric for Review

Routing Step 1	Dean Review	Approve/Don't approve	Please provide comments on the overall merits of the submitted proposal. If you approve, provide any additional comments about project feasibility, impact, investigator capacity, as well as resources if applicable.
If approved:			
Routing Step 2	Ad Hoc Panel Review	Rating Scale 1-9 (1 low, 9 high)— *for multiple categories* 7-9= Application addresses a problem of high importance, few weaknesses 4-6= Application may either address a problem of moderate importance with few weaknesses OR address a problem of high importance with weaknesses that detract from the overall importance 1-3= Application has many weaknesses, either the problem itself is not of high importance, or the application itself does not merit a higher score based on multiple weaknesses	
	For NIH:	**Significance** Rating Scale 1-9 (1 low, 9 high)—	Will the project move the field forward or influence the field in a compelling way; is the project addressing an important problem; does it address any critical knowledge gaps
		Innovation Rating Scale 1-9 (1 low, 9 high)—	Is the work proposed new or unique; if the work proposed is particularly risky, is there enough information provided to assess its feasibility; is the work testing innovative ideas
		Approach Rating Scale 1-9 (1 low, 9 high)—	Are the proposed experiments or aims feasible in the given timeframe; does the PI have experience with what is proposed (is there sufficient preliminary data, for instance); will the project generate meaningful data; are potential pitfalls or alternative approaches discussed
		Investigator Rating Scale 1-9 (1 low, 9 high)—	Is the PI qualified to undertake the proposed work; is the team well-rounded and inclusive of expertise needed to succeed

		Institution Rating Scale 1-9 (1 low, 9 high)—	Are the necessary resources available to carry out a successful project
	For NSF:	**Intellectual Merit** Rating Scale 1-9 (1 low, 9 high)—	What is the potential for the project to advance and/or transform the frontiers of knowledge ■ In the field ■ For society
			Assess creativity, originality of concept
			Is the approach/research plan well-conceived with a solid premise
		Broader Impacts Rating Scale 1-9 (1 low, 9 high)—	What potential does the project offer to benefit society and contribute to desired societal outcomes
		Investigator Rating Scale 1-9 (1 low, 9 high)—	Is the PI qualified to undertake the proposed work; is the team well-rounded and inclusive of expertise needed to succeed
		Institutional resources Rating Scale 1-9 (1 low, 9 high)—	Are the necessary resources available to carry out a successful project
	Other considerations:	**Budget**	Is the proposed budget reasonable and aligned with the scope of work;
		Solicitation-specific criteria and responsiveness to solicitation	How well are any specific solicitation requirements addressed (may add specific review criteria as necessary at internal review stage)