

13/AS/RSCA-PC

Policy and Procedures for the Award of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Grants

1. Recommendations for the awards shall be sent to the President or his/her designee by a reviewing committee comprised of the Leaves and Awards Committee. A representative appointed by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs shall serve as the non-voting Executive Secretary of the reviewing committee. The President or his/her designee may approve or not approve the reviewing committee's recommendation. No award shall be made without the reviewing committee's positive recommendation.

2. Purpose and Types of Awards

RSCA grant funding supports faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity which contributes to one or more of the following: the individual's professional development; the academic discipline; the university; the community.

Each year, the reviewing committee, in consultation with the President or his/her designee, shall determine (consistent with system wide guidelines) how the funds shall be allocated. The level of funding for any year shall not preclude the University administration from augmenting the resources provided to the program.

3. Applicant criteria:

Applicant shall:

1. be a Unit 3 employee; and
2. be willing to complete the appropriate reporting documentation; and
3. write a proposal in a style that makes the project comprehensible to a broad university audience.

4. Criteria for the granting of awards:

A. In deciding which proposals to recommend for funding, the Leaves and Awards Committee will apply the following criteria:

- 1) adherence to the preparation guidelines (proposals not following the guidelines will not be recommended); and
- 2) rank of proposal applicants will *not* be a determining factor in awarding of RSCA grants; and
- 3) proposals for creative and scholarly activities *will* receive the same consideration as research proposals; and
- 4) requests for reassigned time or for travel *will* receive the same consideration as other funding requests (e.g., for equipment, supplies) ; and
- 5) proposals without student participation *will* receive the same consideration as proposals having student participation; and

6) weighted rating of the proposal's clarity, significance and feasibility in each of the following areas and as reflected on the *Rating Criteria Sheet for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Grants* document:

- A. Introduction and background assumptions;
- B. Objectives and rationale;
- C. Contribution to the applicant's professional development;
- D. Contribution(s) to the academic discipline, instructional or curricular enhancements, the university, and/or the community;
- E. Process (creative, scholarly) OR methodological (research) considerations;
- F. Anticipated outcome(s) (creative, scholarly) OR data analyses/results (research);
- G. Project timeline;
- H. Budget justification; and,
- I. Cost estimates.

7) A composite RSCA Rating Criteria score reflecting the average of all committee members' individual scores will be generated for each proposal.

B. The Leaves and Awards Committee will apply the following criteria to allocate available funding to each of the proposals recommended for funding:

1) Using the composite RSCA Rating Criteria score, LAC will recommend that the top 40% of recommended proposals receive 100% of the requested amount. Remaining recommended proposals will be funded according to their composite RSCA Rating Criteria scores and available funds.

5. The awards are conferred on a university-wide basis. Since applications will come from a wide range of disciplines, applicants are encouraged to include letters of support from those who are familiar with the applicant's research, scholarly, or creative activities (e.g. School or College Dean, Department Chair, department or disciplinary colleagues).

6. The reviewing committee, with the administrative assistance of the Executive Secretary, shall provide each applicant with application forms and procedural information. For the purpose of program planning, the applicant shall inform the Department Chair of his/her application.

7. With the administrative assistance of the Executive Secretary, the LAC will provide the composite RSCA Rating Criteria document to each applicant.

NO: _____

Rating Criteria Sheet for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Grants

Name: _____

Project title: _____

Directions: Each rater will review the *Policy and Procedures for the Award of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Grants* and will follow approved guidelines for review of proposals and allocation of funding.

Each rater is to independently read and score the submission using the rubric below. Total column score for clarity is a simple sum of criterion scores; total column scores for significance and feasibility have their respective column sums multiplied by 2.0 (rounded to nearest tenth). The total proposal score is a simple sum of the three total column scores. Raters will meet to discuss their scores and resolve scoring discrepancies. Proposals' final scores will be the mathematical average of all raters' total scores (rounded to nearest tenth).

An application's maximum score possible is **105** points. Applications are ranked according to their final scores with awards distributed to the highest ranking applications until available funds are allocated. Partial funding may be awarded.

Evaluation criteria: Each criterion is to be scored using the following rubric:

	1	2	3	4	5
Clarity	Cannot understand what is being described	In between 1 and 3	Understands what is being described although some questions remain	In between 3 and 5	Understands clearly what is described and has no or only minor questions
Significance	Minimal contribution to the individual's professional development, his or her academic discipline, the university, or the community	In between 1 and 3	Moderate contribution to the individual's professional development, his or her academic discipline, the university, or the community	In between 3 and 5	Maximum contribution to the individual's professional development, his or her academic discipline, the university, or the community
Feasibility	Not doable	In between 1 and 3	May be doable	In between 3 and 5	Clearly doable

1 = Description lacks clarity, significance, or feasibility. The reviewer cannot understand what is being described (lack of clarity); finds minimal contribution to the individual’s professional development, his or her academic discipline, the university, or the community (lack of significance); or, finds what is described not doable (lack of feasibility).

3 = Description has clarity, significance, or feasibility. The reviewer understands what is being described although some questions remain (clarity); finds moderate contribution to the individual’s professional development, his or her academic discipline, the university, or the community (has significance); or, finds what is described may be doable (has feasibility).

5 = Description has high clarity, significance, or feasibility. The reviewer understands clearly what is described and has no or only minor questions (high clarity); finds there to be a maximum contribution to the individual’s professional development, his or her academic discipline, the university, or the community (high significance); or, finds what is described is clearly doable (high feasibility).

Criteria	Clarity (1-5)	Significance (1-5)	Feasibility (1-5)
The proposal’s			
1. introduction and background assumptions.		n/a	n/a
2. objectives and rationale.			n/a
3. contribution to the applicant’s professional development.			n/a
4. contribution(s) to the academic discipline, instructional or curricular enhancements, the university, and/or the community.			n/a
5. process (creative, scholarly) OR methodological (research) considerations.		n/a	
6. anticipated outcome(s) (creative, scholarly) OR data analyses/results (research)		n/a	n/a
7. project timeline.		n/a	
8. budget justification.		n/a	n/a
9. cost estimates.		n/a	
<i>Total Column Summed Score</i>	<u> </u> (Sum)	<u> </u> (Sum)	<u> </u> (Sum)
<i>Total Column Summed Score for Significance and Feasibility multiplied by 2.0 (rounded to nearest tenth)</i>	n/a	<u> </u> (Sum) x 2.0	<u> </u> (Sum) x 2.0
<i>Total Proposal Score (rounded to nearest tenth)</i>	n/a	n/a	<u> </u> (Sum)

Approved by the Academic Senate on May 5, 2020
 Approved by President Ellen Junn on May 22, 2020