

## Research and Scholarly Activity Fund – Adjudication Form

Name of applicant:

Name of reviewer:

<b>Ranking Criteria</b>	<b>Rank 0-5</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>1. Project Description</b> *Is there a project? Are there clearly defined questions and approaches? Is there a timeline, or clearly-stated stages for the project's deployment, development, or completion?</p>		
<p><b>2. How does project contribute to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student skills <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>• Student learning <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>• Innovative approaches</li> </ul> <p>*must address at least one area to be ranked.</p>		
<p><b>3. Relationship / benefits to College mandates, academic plan, initiatives, the community and community partners.</b></p>		
<p><b>4. Potential benefits or outcomes.</b> *can restate some of criterion 3 above, but should focus more on project's disciplinary significance rather than significance to College mandates per se (i.e.: what does the scholarly community get out of it?).</p>		
<p><b>5. Budget allocation.</b> *explanations should appear reasonable and thought out, with a clear sense of why the money needs to be spent and on what. Look for stages of allocation (how much and when) as well as the reasonableness of the request (\$6000 for pens?). Finally, are there clear timelines?</p>		
<p><b>6. C.V.</b> *Does the individual's C.V. suggest that s/he can implement the proposed project? If collaborative, does the PI (principle investigator) provide evidence of being capable of coordinating? If community or institutionally collaborative, is PI's experience relevant to this kind of initiative?</p>		
<p><b>TOTAL POINTS</b></p>		

## RSA Fund Adjudication Guide

The following is a description of the representative characteristics for scoring an application to the RSA Fund. The following explanations should be consulted when assessing the applicant's responses to the criteria outlined on the application form with respect to ranking criteria on the adjudication form.

**A score of 0/5:** Incomplete: blank, qualification(s) of applicant(s) to embark on the activity is/are in question.

**A score of 1/5:** Complete: application appears insubstantial, unclear, or avoids direct engagement with the criteria outlined in the applicable section; budget varied, lacking in specifics; no tangible connection to discipline, College activities, or strategic plan.

**A score of 2/5:** Competent: activity's connection to application criteria difficult to understand, or appears tenuous and unclear; relevance to disciplinary area unclear; does not align clearly with general College strategic directions; budget appears awkwardly assigned and rationalized; proposed activity is outside the disciplinary area of the applicant(s); answers to the criteria are unduly opaque or unclear, clouding explanations of the project / scholarly undertaking.

**A score of 3/5:** Adequate: responses to criteria are fairly concise and accessible; timelines or budgetary requests may appear unrealistic (or imprecise), but are nonetheless connected to clear deliverables; vague connection to strategic priorities of the College or the discipline; applicant(s) are proposing an activity that does not reflect any previous disciplinary or professional experience; goals and outcomes are unclear, tangential.

**A score of 4/5:** Successful: application responds to criteria clearly and directly, making the proposed activity easy to understand and visualize; proposed activity is well thought out and has clear timelines and budgetary requests that correspond to outcomes; proposed activity responds to College strategic plan and criteria; prior work in the field / discipline aligns well with the proposed activity; realistic goals and tangible outcomes.

**A score of 5/5:** Exceptional: clear responses to the criteria with explanations that illuminate proposed activity's questions, timelines, budget, and outcomes; clearly articulated connections between activity, funding criteria, and College strategic plan; conception of proposed activity reflects readiness to engage with research, scholarship, or scholarly community in a way that will enhance College environment (i.e.: classroom, infrastructure, culture); clear connection between developmental stages of the proposed activity and the developmental stages of College strategic priorities; disciplinary specialty and professional work aligns with the proposed activity and suggests ongoing development and deployment beyond the scope of the award.