

ATTACHMENT A

App #: _____
Name: _____

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

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>			<u> </u> (Sum)