***PROPOSAL REVIEW RUBRIC AND CRITERIA***

WiSys Spark Grant applications should be scored based on the following criteria: A) Intellectual Property Potential, B) Competitive Product Environment and Market Need, C) Project Feasibility and Evidence of Preliminary Findings, D) Development Timeline, E) Suitability of Team, and F) Value for Money.

WiSys has rated criterion A for Intellectual Property based upon an initial IP assessment conducted by WiSys on the corresponding Invention Disclosure received. Each committee member is asked to rate the remaining criterion (B-F) using the guidance provided below for each category to assign a score between 1 and 5. A maximum of 40 points can be allocated per project proposal and applications must earn a minimum of 20 points using the rubric below in order to be recommended for funding.

*(Note: Please note weightings in sections A and B)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **POINTS** |
| **A. Intellectual Property Potential:** *Do the outcomes of the project have potential to be protected by Intellectual Property? In other words is the project concept novel and unique?*  Score:  1 – Technology field is crowded, patentability unlikely.  3 – Patentable with limited scope; or not patentable but protectable via other form of intellectual property (e.g. copyright, trademark, know-how etc.)  5 – Related invention is novel and patentable with broad scope. | \_\_\_ x 2 = \_\_\_ |
| **B. Competitive Product Environment and Market Need:** *Does the proposed concept have potential to address an unmet market need? Are there existing solutions available and if so, can the proposed concept be differentiated?*  Score:  1 – Existing solutions meet proposed market and customer need.  3 – Some solutions exist, however there are limitations or disadvantages to their use.  5 – Either few or no solutions exist, solution of proposed project addresses a clear and unmet market/customer need. | \_\_\_ x 2 = \_\_\_ |
| **C. Evidence of Project Feasibility and/or Preliminary Findings:** *Is the project feasible. Has the applicant generated any preliminary findings to support feasibility?*  Score:  1 – No preliminary findings exist to support feasibility of proposed project. Project is concept only.  3 – Minimal preliminary findings generated to support feasibility of project.  5 – Applicant has demonstrated progress beyond initial discovery and has solid preliminary findings to support feasibility. |  |
| **D. Development Timeline:** *What is the timeline for concept development?*  Score:  1 – The proposed project has a long-term development timeline (e.g. >3 years).  3 – The proposed project has medium-term development timeline (e.g. 2-3 years)  5 – The proposed solution is near ready for partnering, short-term development timeline (e.g. <12 months). |  |
| **E. Suitability of the PI/Team:**  Score:  1 – PI/Team have no relevant competencies to carry out proposed project.  3 – PI/Team have relevant competencies, but work load is at a maximum and capacity is a concern.  5 – PI/Team is well suited and has ability to follow through on project. |  |
| **F. Value for Money:** *Does the project provide value for money?*  Score:  1 – Budget does not provide value for money.  3 – Budget provides reasonable value for money.  5 – Budget provides excellent value for money. |  |
| **Total Points / 40 (with weightings)** |  |

**COMMENTS:**