



# CAL POLY

Research, Economic Development  
& Graduate Education

## SCORING SHEET

RSCA GRANT PROGRAM 2023-24

Criteria	Score Range				
<b>Objectives</b> (0-3 points)	0	1	2	3	
<b>Benefit to Cal Poly</b> (0-2 points)	0	1	2		
<b>Budget justification</b> (0-3 points)	0	1	2	3	
<b>Interdisciplinary</b> (0-1 point)	0	1			
<b>Potential to attract future funding</b> (0-1 point)	0	1			
<b>Support of field with minimal access to external funding</b> (0-1 point)	0	1			
<b>Involves student(s)</b> (0-1 point)	0	1			
<b>Qualifications of principal investigator(s)</b> (0-3 points)	0	1	2	3	
<b>Intellectual merit</b> (0-4 points)	0	1	2	3	4
<b>1) Is the PI a lecturer or tenure track faculty?</b>	Yes	No			
<b>2) Is the PI a tenured associate or full professor?</b>	Yes	No			
<b>3) If the PI is a tenured associate or full professor, is this a change in focus?</b>	Yes	No	Unclear		
<b>If the proposal and the PI meets requirements for funding, do you recommend the proposal receive funding?</b>	Yes	No, the proposal is not fundable	No, the PI is not eligible		



## Rating Definitions

### Objectives

Are the objectives specific, measurable, realistic, and feasible? Have the goals been clearly articulated in the timeline? Are measures included that can be used to evaluate success, if applicable?

- 
- 0 *Not enough* information provided to determine if objectives and goals contribute to sound methodology and significant contribution.
- 
- 1 *Vague* information provided and is difficult to determine if objective(s), outcome, and timeline provided contribute to sound methodology and significant contribution.
- 
- 2 *Clear* information provided and it is likely that the objective(s), outcome, and timeline provided contribute to sound methodology and significant contribution.
- 
- 3 *Specific* information provided and the objective(s), outcome, and timeline provided will contribute to sound methodology and significant contribution.
- 

### Benefit to Cal Poly

Was a statement provided of the benefits that will accrue to the University, to the creative, scholarly, or scientific profession, and/or to students?

- 
- 0 *No* justification is provided addressing the project's benefits.
- 
- 1 *Adequate* justification addressing the project's benefits has been provided.
- 
- 2 *Excellent* justification addressing the projects' benefits has been provided.
- 

### Budget Justification

Is the requested funding clearly justified? Does it meet the scope of RSCA funding? Have justifications been provided for the use of assigned time, additional compensation, need for supplies and travel, support for student research assistant salaries, plus any other types of expenses that will be needed? If a proposed budget exceeds the maximum budget, mark them down one score for going over budget. For example, if you would have given justification a score of 2, reduce to 1.

- 
- 0 Funding *does not meet* RSCA scope, such as a request for a purpose fully disallowed by the RFP.
- 
- 1 Funding is *not* well-justified but meets all components of RSCA scope, or part of the funding justification is disallowed by the RFP.
- 
- 2 Funding is *adequately* justified, meets all components of RSCA scope, and fully allowed by the RFP.
- 
- 3 Funding is *strongly* justified, meets all components of RSCA scope, and fully allowed by the RFP.
-



**Qualifications of principal investigator(s)**

Does (Do) the PI(s) have a record of accomplishment in the field, publications, and funding history?

- 
- 0 *PI lacks* the expertise to successfully manage the proposed project.
- 
- 1 *PI lacks* the expertise in most areas related to the proposed project.
- 
- 2 *PI possesses most but not all* the expertise needed to successfully manage the proposed project.
- 
- 3 *PI possesses a high-level* of the expertise needed to successfully manage the proposed project.
- 

**Intellectual merit**

Is the project scientifically or creatively sound?

Will it advance the field or discipline by generating significant new thought and learning?

- 
- 0 *Not enough* information provided to evaluate if creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is significant, and methodology is sound.
- 
- 1 *Adequate* information provided; creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is not significant and/or methodology is not sound.
- 
- 2 *Articulate* information provided; creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is significant, or methodology is sound.
- 
- 3 *Articulate* information provided; creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is significant, and methodology is sound.
- 
- 4 *Articulate* information provided; creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is extremely significant, and methodology is extremely sound.
-