Rubric for Applications Evaluation by the Research and Professional Development (R&PD) Committee

The R&PD committee meets to review and discuss applications for all rounds of internal awards that fall under the purview of the committee (e.g. R&PD Main Round, Adjunct Faculty Opportunity Fund [AFOF], Provost Faculty Opportunity Fund [PFOF], Sabbaticals and Course Releases). Please see the [Research and Professional Development Internal Award Program Guidelines](#) document for specific details about each type of internal award.

The main criteria by which the R&PD committee evaluates applications is the completeness of the application, the quality of the budget justification and the 3-page written narrative. When evaluating the quality of the budget justification and the written narrative, the committee uses the rubric found in the table below. Unsatisfactory evaluations in any one of the factors listed in the rubric may be grounds for the committee deciding to not recommend an application for award.

When the R&PD committee meets to discuss the applications, the ultimate decision to recommend an award or not is based on a majority-rules "Recommend for Award" vs. "Not Recommend for Award" vote that is held after discussing each application.

Unfortunately, there are times when the amount of funds/course releases/sabbaticals made available by the University for a given round of internal award may exceed the amount of funds/course releases/sabbaticals that the committee would like to recommend for award. When that occurs, it is possible that an applicant may not receive the award or full award requested even though the application was evaluated favorably by the R&PD committee.

In addition to the application being evaluated as Unsatisfactory (as defined in the rubric below), applications will not be recommended for award for the following reasons:
● The faculty member or project does not meet all of the Eligibility requirements detailed in the "Eligibility" section of [Research and Professional Development Internal Award Program Guidelines](#) document (page 2)
● The funded work to be done, or the time of the course release or sabbatical falls outside of the funding period time frame available for the round for which the application was made.
● The written narrative exceeds the 2 or 3-page maximum limit, depending upon the specific award guidelines
● The application does not include all required materials (completed online application, completed funding history/accountability section, 2 or 3-page maximum narrative, description of budget justification, 2-page CV, Dean's signature, completed Understanding of Conditions for Internal Awards)
● The application is submitted after the deadline
● Final Reports from previously awarded internal awards are not up to date.

Factors Evaluated	Satisfactory Standards	Unsatisfactory Standards
Aims and Objectives "*What Do You Plan to Accomplish?*"	-A thorough, clear and concise description of the project to be completed using the award -Evaluators are not left with questions about what you hope to accomplish with the award that cannot be answered by reading your application -Evaluators do not need to make assumptions about what you hope to accomplish with the award -The award is intended to be used to work on an appropriate scholarly and/or creative project	-It is not entirely clear what work is intended to be completed using the award; evaluators find your description of the aims/objectives of the project confusing or unthorough -Evaluators are left with questions about what you hope to accomplish with the award that cannot be answered by reading your application -Evaluators need to make assumptions about what you hope to accomplish with the award -The award is intended to be used for work on that is not a suitable scholarly and/or creative project
Background Work Already Completed	-The work you have accomplished prior to the award period that is directly relevant to the project you are applying for an award to work on has been summarized clearly -Evaluators do not need to refer to external documents (e.g. published works, websites) to understand your relevant prior work	-Prior work directly relevant to the project that is intended to be worked on using the award is not summarized at all or is not clearly summarized -Evaluators are required to refer to external documents (e.g. published works, websites) to clearly understand

	-The current project that is intended to be worked on with the award is a logical follow-up to or extension of the Background Work Already completed that is described in the narrative. In the case that you are proposing a project in a new or unrelated area of scholarship relative to your past work, then you should describe what you have done to prepare yourself to successfully complete the proposed project.	the relevant background work already completed -The Background Work Already Completed that is summarized is not clearly relevant to and/or a logical follow-up and/or extension to the project that is intended to be worked on using the award
Procedure/Methodology "*How and when do you plan to accomplish the work you intend to do?*"	-How the project intended to be worked on will be accomplished is clearly and unambiguously described -Specific methods, procedures and processes used for research and/or creative activities are clearly described in as much detail as space will allow -The methods, procedures and/or processes described are appropriate to the project and/or to the field that is directly relevant to the project (as much as can be judged by the academically diverse members of the committee that, as a whole, are not experts in your field of scholarship or creative activity) -A clear timeline is included that describes what will be worked on and when during the award period (e.g. a month-to-month or week-to-week schedule of activities), with an estimate of the time it will take (in hours per week or per sub-activity) to complete each aspect of the project -For each month or week found in the timeline, it is clear what will be accomplished and how it will be accomplished -The timeline falls precisely within the award period (does not begin before or after the beginning or end of the award period) -For projects that are being worked on with multiple collaborators, a clear description and delineation of the responsibilities and work to be directly accomplished by the applicant versus their collaborators	-How the project intended to be worked on is not clearly or unambiguously described; evaluators find your description of methods and procedures confusing -There is a lack of details about the specific methods, procedures and/or processes to be used for research and/or creative activities that results in evaluators not being entirely clear on how the project is intended to be accomplished -The methods, procedures and/or processes described are judged to not be appropriate to the project and/or the field that is directly relevant to the project (as much as can be judged by the academically diverse members of the committee) -A detailed timeline is not included at all, or a timeline is included that is missing essential details (e.g. a detailed month-to-month or week-to-week schedule; what activities will be specifically worked on and completed during each week or month found in the timeline; missing estimates of hours of week per week on the different phases of the project) -All or a portion of the timeline falls outside of the award period -For projects that are being worked on with multiple collaborators, it is unclear what the applicant's specific responsibilities are and the work they will directly complete versus the responsibilities of their collaborators
Importance/Value "*Why do you plan to accomplish the work you intend to do?*"	-The significance/merit of the project is clearly described -How the research and/or creative activity to be completed using the award contributes to the field that the project is	-The significance/merit of the project is not clearly described. Evaluators are left with questions or left with having to make assumptions that cannot be clarified by reading your

	most relevant to is clearly described and/or contributes to the betterment of our society/community is clearly described -(*If applicable*) Non-expert committee members clearly understand the gap/limitations in prior research that the current project to be worked on using the award helps fill/improve upon	application that lead them to be unsure about what the significance/merit of your project is -It is unclear how the research and/or creative activity to be worked on using the award contributes to the field most relevant to the project and/or contributes to the betterment of our society/community -(If applicable) Non-expert committee members are not clear on what gaps/limitations in prior research are being addressed by the project to be worked on using the award
Outcomes	-Prospective outcomes of the project are clearly described -Prospective outcomes are appropriate to the project and/or the field/discipline the project is most directly related to (e.g. creative exhibitions, peer-reviewed journal articles, chapters, books, conference presentations, software etc.)	-No prospective outcomes are described, or they are not clearly described -Identified prospective outcomes are not appropriate to the project and/or the field/discipline the project is most directly related to
Language	-Language and terminology that is used is appropriate for the general audience that composes the R&PD committee -General lack of the use of discipline-specific, technical jargon that cannot be understood by committee members unfamiliar with the discipline and/or area of research/creative activity relevant to the project -When the use of discipline-specific jargon is deemed by the applicant as essential, the use of such jargon does not impede understanding of the application. All technical terms used are clearly defined and clearly understood by a general audience unfamiliar with the discipline and/or area of research/creative activity relevant to the project	-Language and terminology that is used is inappropriate for the general audience that composes the R&PD committee -Use of discipline-specific, technical jargon that is undefined or not clearly defined and that impedes evaluators' understanding of the project being described
Budget Justification	For Course Releases and Sabbaticals: A persuasive argument is found within the entirety of your application that the time and effort needed to accomplish the project necessitates the course release or the 1- or 2-semester sabbatical you are applying for For Monetary Awards: -It is clear how the total requested monetary award was calculated and how it will be utilized to complete the project.	For Course Releases and Sabbaticals: -It is unclear how the time you receive from the Course Release or Sabbatical will be used to accomplish your project. -It is judged that the time/effort required to complete the project is does not justify the amount of time you will receive via a course release or a 1- or 2-semester sabbatical, OR a persuasive argument is not established

	-A line-item budget is included in the application form and the narrative clearly justifies how each cost is necessary for the successful completion of the project.	within the entirety of your application that justifies the course release or sabbatical time you are applying for For Monetary Awards: -It is unclear how the total requested monetary award was calculated and how it will be utilized to complete the project -A line-item budget is not included in the application form and/or the narrative does not clearly justify how each cost is necessary for the successful completion of the project.