

Scoring Rubric for 2020-21 RSCA Grants

Applicant Name: _____ Rank _____

Title: _____

For items 1-7 below, rate each criterion using the following scale based on the quality of the proposal:

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent

1.	The project is clearly described. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
2.	The end result/anticipated outcome(s) of the project is/are clearly described. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
3.	The relevance of the project to its field is well defined and indicates how the project will make an important contribution to the field. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
4.	The project components/activities are clearly described and feasible and support the project outcome(s). <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
5.	The project timeframe is clearly described and appropriate. The project is feasible and all components/activities are manageable in the timeframe. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
6.	The description of how the project will enhance the applicant's professional growth is clear. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
7.	The budget is clearly described, justified, itemized, and reasonable. <i>Comments:</i> If appropriate, current CSU mileage and per diem rates are used ___Yes ___No If appropriate, is an assigned time request adequately justified? ___Yes ___No	1	2	3	4	5

8. If students are involved in the project, the description makes clear the nature of student involvement and how this involvement promotes the faculty member's professional development. ___Yes ___No ___ N/A

9. If multiple faculty submit a single proposal, the description makes clear the collaborative nature of the project as well as each faculty member's role in the project. ___Yes ___No ___ N/A

10. Are final reports of previous RSCA Grants on file? ___Yes ___No ___ N/A

11. Applicant seeking outside funding for proposed activities ___Yes ___ No

12. Applicant has other funding (startup or other internal funding) for this proposed research ___Yes ___No