## 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.gR&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 **budget** justification and 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 grounds for the committee deciding to not recommendate in the rubric 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" vo4 (t)6.9 (od)1.6 (A)556 (A)5.1 (w5.3 (>4 (t)6.9 (e)4.9 (d) (A)556 (A)556 (A)5.1 (w5.3 (>4 (t)6.9 (e)4.9 (d) (A)556 (A)556 (A)556 (A)556 (A)556 (A)556 (A)556 (A)556 (A)556 (A)566 (A

	T	
" <u>Wha</u> t 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 wor on an appropriate scholarly and/or creating project	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
Background Work Already Completed	-The work you have accomplished prior the award period that is directly relevant	•
	the project you are applying for an award	
	work on has been summarized clearly	at all or is not clearly summarized
	-Evaluators do not need to refer to extern	•
	documents (e.g. published works, websitee)xternal documents (e.g. published	
	to understand your relevant prior work	works, websites) to clearly understa

	The current project that is intended to be	the relevant background work alread
	-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 to 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	completed -The Background Work Already t Completed that is summarized is not thatearly relevant to and/or a logical follow-up and/or extension to the project that is intended to be worked on using the award
	successfully complete the proposed proje	
Procedure/Methodology  "How and wherdo you plan to accomplish the work you intend to do?"	-How the project intended to be worked of will be accomplished is clearly and unambiguously described -Specific methods, procedures and processes used for research and/or creat 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 the project (as much as can be judged by the academically diverse members of the committee that, as a whole, are not experin your field of scholarship or creative activity) -A clear timeline is included that describe what will be worked on and when during the award period (e.g. a mortth-month or weekto-week schedule of activities), with an estimate of the time it will take (in hou per week or per subscrivity) 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 a the beginning or end of the award period) -For projects that are being worked on wirmultiple collaborators, a clear description and delineation of the responsibilities and work to be directly accomplished by the applicant versus their collaborators	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 montito-month or weektoweek 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)  Holl 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	-The significance/merit of the project is clearly described	-The significance/merit of the projec is not clearly described. Evaluators
"Whydo you plan to accomplish the work you intend to do?	-How the research and/or creative activity uto be completed using the award contributes to the field that the project is	1

	most relevant to is clearly described and/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	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
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 journa articles, chapters, books, conference presentations, software etc.) -Language and terminology that is used i appropriate for the general audience that composes the R&PD committee	-No prospective outcomes are described, or they are not clearly described -Identified prospective outcomes are not appropriate to the project and/or althe field/discipline the project is most directly related to
Language	-General lack of the use of discipline- specific, technical jargon that cannot be understood by committee members unfamiliar with the discipline and/or area research/creative activity relevant to the project -When the use of disciplingpecific jargon	of