

RSCA Rating Definitions

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.
	Articulate information provided; creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is
	significant, OR methodology is sound. Articulate information provided; creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is
3	significant, AND methodology is sound.
4	Articulate information provided; creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is extremely
	significant, and methodology is extremely sound.
5	Articulate information provided; creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution and
	methodology described are outstanding.

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?

Not enough information provided to determine if objectives and goals lead to sound methodology and significant contributions.

1 Vague information provided and is difficult to determine if objective(s), outcome, and timeline provided lead to sound methodology and significant contributions.

2 Clear information provided and it is likely that the objective(s), outcome, and timeline provided lead to sound methodology and significant contributions.

3 Specific information provided and the objective(s), outcome, and timeline provided will lead to sound methodology and significant contributions.

4 Specific information provided and the objective(s), outcome, and timeline provided will lead to sound methodology and outstanding contributions.



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?

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

Benefit to Cal Poly

Was a statement provided of the benefits that will accrue to the University 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.

Benefits beyond the University

Was a statement provided describing the societal impacts of the project and how those outside of the University will benefit?

- 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.

Other Review Criteria

- Eligibility Verification
 - PI(s) is/are qualified (Y/N)
 - Change in focus (for tenured)



- Potential to attract future funding (+1)
- Support of fields and disciplines with minimal access to external funding (+1)
- Involvement of students (+1)
- Have you previously received RSCA funding before? (Y/N) If so, when? Have you submitted an external proposal since the closure of your RSCA award?
- Have you previously received TSMG funding before? (Y/N) If so, when? Have you submitted an external proposal since the closure of your TSMG award?