

NSLS-II Proposal Review Panel Review Rubric (April 2024)

General User, Block Allocation Group, Partner User

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| Scientific, technological, industrial, and/or national security importance | | 45% |
| Does the proposed research address critical questions or significantly advance knowledge in the specific field of research and development? | | |
| 1 | Groundbreaking research that could revolutionize critical knowledge in a specific field. High impact in the field would be almost certain. | |
| 2 | High quality research that could significantly advance knowledge in a specific field. High impact in the field would be likely. | |
| 3 | Research will likely produce incremental advances in an established area, leading to some impact in a specific field. | |
| 4 | Research may provide minimal new knowledge in a specific field, and unlikely to have significant impact. | |
| 5 | Research is unlikely to make any contributions to a specific field. | |

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| Quality of experimental plan | | 40% |
| Is the proposed experimental plan well developed to address the scientific questions? Is the choice of beamlines appropriate? Does the proposal team have sufficient resources, expertise, and/or collaboration to execute the proposed work? | | |
| 1 | Experimental plan demonstrates optimal understanding of facility resources and is well-developed and highly likely to achieve the experimental goals. | |
| 2 | Experimental plan is well thought out and will likely achieve most experimental goals. | |
| 3 | Experimental plan would benefit from guidance from facility staff but could achieve some experimental goals. | |
| 4 | Experimental plan is lacking critical details and may not produce any impactful results. | |
| 5 | Experimental plan is not feasible. | |

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| Societal impact | | 15% |
| Does the proposed work have significant broader indirect societal impact, in such areas as economic competitiveness, workforce development, education and outreach, and/or engagement promoting inclusive and equitable research? | | |
| 1 | Proposed work will have broader societal impact in more than one area listed above or a new area (please specify in evaluation comments). | |
| 2 | Proposed work will have broader societal impact in one of the areas listed above or a new area (please specify in evaluation comments). | |
| 3 | Proposed work may not have broader societal impact in the areas listed above. | |
| 4 | Rating of 4 is not used for this criterion | |
| 5 | Rating of 5 is not used for this criterion | |

Rapid Access (RA)

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| Scientific, technological, industrial, and/or national security importance, including whether it fits into the criteria for RA beam time | | 45% |
| Does the proposed research address critical questions or significantly advance knowledge in the specific field of research and development? | | |
| 1 | Groundbreaking research that could revolutionize critical knowledge in a specific field. High impact in the field would be almost certain. | |
| 2 | High quality research that could significantly advance knowledge in a specific field. High impact in the field would be likely. | |
| 3 | Research will likely produce incremental advances in an established area, leading to some impact in a specific field. | |
| 4 | Research may provide minimal new knowledge in a specific field, and unlikely to have significant impact. | |
| 5 | Research is unlikely to make any contributions to a specific field. | |

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| Quality of experimental plan | | 40% |
| Is the proposed experimental plan well developed to address the scientific questions? Is the choice of beamlines appropriate? Does the proposal team have sufficient resources, expertise, and/or collaboration to execute the proposed work? | | |
| 1 | Experimental plan demonstrates optimal understanding of facility resources and is well-developed and highly likely to achieve the experimental goals. | |
| 2 | Experimental plan is well thought out and will likely achieve most experimental goals. | |
| 3 | Experimental plan would benefit from guidance from facility staff but could achieve some experimental goals. | |
| 4 | Experimental plan is lacking critical details and may not produce any impactful results. | |
| 5 | Experimental plan is not feasible. | |

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| Societal impact | | 15% |
| Does the proposed work have significant broader indirect societal impact, in such areas as economic competitiveness, workforce development, education and outreach, and/or engagement promoting inclusive and equitable research? | | |
| 1 | Proposed work will have broader societal impact in more than one area listed above or a new area (please specify in evaluation comments). | |
| 2 | Proposed work will have broader societal impact in one of the areas listed above or a new area (please specify in evaluation comments). | |
| 3 | Proposed work may not have broader societal impact in the areas listed above. | |
| 4 | Rating of 4 is not used for this criterion | |
| 5 | Rating of 5 is not used for this criterion | |