

**Research Allocations Committee Proposal Scoring Rubric (Page 1 of 2)**

Points:	1	2	3	4	5
<p><b>Significance &amp; Innovation</b></p> <p><b>20%</b></p>	Poor concept of project. No clear statement of the significance of the project, and not clear how project will complement, challenge, or expand relevant studies in the field.	Inadequate concept of project. Inadequate statement of the significance of the project. Inadequate explanation of how project will complement, challenge, or expand relevant studies in the field.	Adequate concept of project, including clear statement of the significance of the project. Adequate explanation of how project will complement, challenge, or expand relevant studies in the field.	Good concept of project, including a very clear statement of the significance of the project and very clear explanation of how project will complement, challenge, or expand relevant studies in the field.	Exceptional strength of concept of project, including a convincing statement of the significance of the project and explanation of how project will complement, challenge, or expand relevant studies in the field.  (Clear explanation of the potential to attract funding from extramural sources, such as NSF, NIH, NEA, IES.)
<p><b>Methods, Work Plan, and Potential for Completion</b></p> <p><b>20%</b></p>	Poor concept of how project will be executed. Completion seems unlikely.	Inadequate concept of how project will be executed. Outline for project unclear. Likelihood of completion seems questionable.	Adequate concept of execution of project. Organized outline of project. Likelihood of completion seems possible.	Good concept of how project will be executed. Well-organized outline of project. Likelihood of completion seems strong.	Exceptional articulation of how project will take place. Comprehensive and well-organized outline of the project. Likelihood of completion seems assured.
<p><b>Clarity</b></p> <p><b>20%</b></p>	Poor crafting of proposal. Applicant addresses few of the submission requirements, as outlined in the call for proposals.  Poor grammar, format and spelling.	Inadequate crafting of proposal. Applicant only addresses the most basic of submission requirements, as outlined in the call for proposals.  Inadequate grammar, format and spelling.	Adequate crafting of proposal. Applicant covers all the submission requirements, as outlined in the call for proposals.  Adequate grammar format and spelling.	Good crafting of proposal. Applicant clearly and convincingly addresses all the submission requirements, as outlined in the call for proposals.  Good grammar, format and spelling.	Exceptional crafting of proposal. Applicant addresses all the submission requirements with extraordinary clarity and convincing rhetoric, as outlined in the call for proposals.  Exemplary writing is clear, concise, and comprehensive including grammar, format and spelling. (Proposal could be submitted to an outside funder).

<p><b>Broader Impacts</b></p> <p><b>20%</b></p>	<p>Poor research impact: Impact on targeted areas not addressed.</p>	<p>Inadequate research impact: Proposes some impact, mostly limited to disciplinary interest.</p>	<p>Adequate research impact: Proposes clear impact in at least one targeted area beyond its disciplinary interest (e.g., UNM, New Mexico community, national and global impacts</p>	<p>Good research impact: Proposes clear impact in more than one targeted area beyond its disciplinary interest (e.g., UNM, New Mexico community, national and global impacts</p>	<p>Exceptional research impact: Proposes exemplary impact in more than one targeted area beyond its disciplinary interest; (Projected impact would be compelling to an external funder such as the NEA/NEH, McCune Foundation etc.)</p>
<p><b>Budget &amp; Budget Justification</b></p> <p><b>20%</b></p>	<p>Projected use of funds is poor. The role of RAC funding is unclear. Budget contains significant technical flaws, or includes no justification.</p>	<p>Projected use of funds is inadequate. Unclear which part of the project will be supported by RAC funding. Budget justification is unclear, or contains flaws.</p>	<p>Projected use of funds is adequate. Adequate description of role of RAC funding. Budget contains appropriate justification, with only minor flaws in applying budget requirements.</p>	<p>Projected use of funds is good. Clear which part of the project will be supported by RAC funding. Budget justification is clear and contains no errors.</p>	<p>Projected use of funds is clearly defined in the itemized budget. Very clear which part of the project will be supported by RAC funding. Funding requests are compelling and justified, with no errors in budget requirements.</p>