

Research and Creative Activities (RSCA) Application Guidelines

RSCA awards are administered via the [InfoReady](#) site and may be requested for one of the following:

1. **3 units of Reassigned Time**
2. **4 units of Reassigned Time**
3. **6 units of Reassigned Time** (in one semester or across two semesters)
4. **Faculty Small Grant up to \$5,000**
5. **3 units of Reassigned Time + Faculty Small Grant up to \$1,550** (equivalent to 1 unit of Reassigned Time)
6. **3 units of Reassigned Time + Faculty Small Grant up to \$3,100** (equivalent to 2 units of Reassigned Time)
7. **3 units of Reassigned Time + Faculty Small Grant up to \$4,650** (equivalent to 3 units of Reassigned Time)

Application Requirements:

- All RSCA proposals are for scholarly and/or creative activities contributing to the academic field.
- All RSCA proposals must include the following (3 pages, single spaced – exceptions are indicated below):
 1. Study Description
 - 1.1 Title (may be tentative)
 - 1.2 Brief description (1-2 paragraphs)
 - 1.3 Background (describe context, need, significance, and/or unique contribution) – this can include justification for emerging scholars and/or importance of proposed scholarship/creative activity for more experienced scholars
 2. Methods (modify to fit method chosen as appropriate) (Note: the study can include creative activities – if so, modify as appropriate)
 - 2.1 Study design
 - 2.2 Research questions; hypotheses
 - 2.3 Sample selection
 - 2.4 Instrument development and/or selection
 - 2.5 Method of data collection
 - 2.6 Data coding and analyses
 3. Anticipated outcomes
 - 3.1 Anticipated portions of the study to be completed during the RSCA period
 - 3.2 Anticipated timeline for completion of the entire study (extending beyond the RSCA period)
 4. List of Principal Investigator (PI) and Co-PIs
 - 4.1 Name(s), titles, and institutions
 - 4.2 Roles for each including percentage of effort
 5. Justification for requested units
 - 5.1 Clear request for number of units and justification (see Guide for Justification of Reassigned Time below)

- 5.2 Timeline with percentage of efforts for each number of units (see Guide for Justification of Reassigned Time below)
 6. Include references/ citations in an addendum (not included in the 3-page limit)
 7. Include a CV for the PI(s) in an addendum (not included in the 3-page limit)
- All RSCA proposals must include a Faculty History (2 pages, single spaced)
 1. Qualifications for study
 2. Summary of presentations, publications, and research activities for the previous 5 years.

Guide for Justification of Reassigned Time

As a rough guideline, 3 units of reassigned time is equivalent to 9 hours of instructional labor per week for one semester. Faculty requesting 6 units of reassignment time are encouraged to demonstrate that the need for additional support is matched by the elaboration specified in the proposal. For example, if the faculty member is requesting 6 units to cover a bigger project that requires multiple phases (e.g., survey development, sample selection, data collection, data coding and analyses, writing of the manuscript), the faculty member has to clarify and specify the time needed for each phase. (More details are included in the RSCA description table).

Faculty requesting 6 units to cover 2 smaller related projects are encouraged to make sure the expected outcome from each project is listed and ensure that the two projects are different from each other. The PI and any co-PIs must be listed clearly and the share of work that the PI will be undertaking must be clarified.

Guide for Faculty History

The **Faculty History** must identify all RSCA awards received for the past five academic years and must also state what the expected outcomes were (e.g., peer-reviewed manuscript, data collection for X number of subjects, conference presentations, etc.). Faculty should also explain if outcomes were not accomplished and why (e.g., COVID-19 restrictions on in-person data collection, paper submitted for review but not yet accepted, etc.). Note that documentation such as reports can be included in an addendum – not included in the 2-page limit.

Ranking

Both *Reassigned Time* and *Small Faculty Grant* proposals will be evaluated by the CHHS Research Committee and the Dean, based on: **(50 Points)**. (More details are included in the ranking criteria table).

1. **Description**, Overall proposal clarity and completeness evaluated as an integral part of proposal content = **5 Points**
2. **Background**. Description of the context, need, significance and/or unique contribution of the proposed scholarly or creative activity = **10 Points**
3. **Methods**: Description of research methods or kind of creative activity to be undertaken including feasibility and appropriateness = **15 Points**
4. **Outcomes and Goals**: Clarity and value of RSCA-specific outcomes and goals = **5 Points**

5. Justification of Reassigned Time: Clarity and fit of request to reassigned time requested = **5 Points**

6. Faculty History. Faculty history including presentations, publications and research activities in the past five years and consideration of RSCA request given prior productivity = **10 Points**

Ranking Criteria

Criteria #1	1	2	3	4	5
Proposal clarity and completeness evaluated as an integral part of proposal content. Description of the scholarly or creative activity.	The proposal was unclear and/or incomplete.	Proposal provided some important elements but lacked clarity and completeness and was hard for reviewers to follow.	Proposal was somewhat clear and complete but missed key elements or was confusing to reviewers.	The proposal was mostly well written and complete. It lacked a few details. If the details were included, the reviewers would have found it helpful.	The proposal was extremely well written, complete, and conveyed appropriate content.
Criteria #2	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
Background and need or significance in the discipline of the proposed scholarly or creative activity.	Both the significance and the background were missing, or it was presented in a very unclear manner.	The background and significance for the proposed study are unclear or not well established.	Either the significance or background was not well established.	The background and significance were somewhat well established.	The background of what has already been conducted was well written. The way the proposed study will fill in the gap(s) was clearly stated.
Criteria #3	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-15
Research Methods	The research design, methodology, and creative activity had significant flaws or there were serious omissions.	The research design, methodology, or creative activity was somewhat well developed but has some flaws that the reviewers were concerned about.	The research design, methodology, or creative activity has some gaps, but seems largely appropriate for what is being proposed.	The research design, methodology, or creative activity seems logical and feasible. There are just a few minor issues with what is being proposed.	Proposal presents sound research designs and methodologies.

Criteria # 4	1	2	3	4	5
Anticipated outcomes and goals/ timeline	Outcomes/ Timelines not included. No separate outcomes for distinct phases of the 6 WTU proposals.	Outcomes/Timeline is vague. No separate outcomes for distinct phases of the 6 WTU proposals.	Outcomes/ Timeline is stated without identification where the findings will be disseminated. No separate outcomes for distinct phases of the 6 WTU proposals.	Outcomes/ Timeline clearly stated, applicant identified Where to disseminate the RSCA findings. Separate outcomes for distinct phases of the 6 WTU proposals.	Outcomes/Timeline clearly stated, applicant identified where to disseminate the RSCA findings. Clear justification of the selection of the (e.g., Journal, conference). Separate outcomes for distinct phases of the 6 WTU proposals.
Criteria # 5	1	2	3	4	5
Justification of requested number of WTUs and/or dollar amount requested	No clear justification for the requested WTUs/budget. Phases of study to be undertaken, Is the study a Collaboration with other researchers, will a grant application be submitted, Will students be involved in the study, what is the complexity of the study?	The justification for WTU/\$ is inconsistent with the proposed timeline/budget.	The request of WTUs/budget is justified to some extent.	The request of WTUs/budget is justified and clear.	The justification for WTU/\$ is clear and consistent with the proposed outcomes and the timeline/budget.

Criteria #6	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
Faculty history including professional/academic research presentations, peer reviewed publications, and research activities in the past five years. A. Tenured Faculty B. Full-time lecturers and tenure-track faculty	A. 1 publication + 1 Presentation	A. 2 Publications + 2 Presentation Submitted 2 RSCAs /5 years	A. 3 publications + 3 Presentations Submitted 3 RSCAs /in past 5 years	A. 4 publications + 4 Presentations Submitted 4 RSCAs /in the past 5 years	A. +5 publications + 5 Presentations + 5 RSCAs /in the past 5 years
	B. Presentation	B. 1-2 Presentations	B. 1 Publication + 1-2 Presentations	B. 2 Publications + 2 Presentations	B. 3 or more publications + 3 presentations

RSCA Type Description

RSCA Type	Description
3 units of Assigned Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New research project, use secondary data set, or - Work on one publication from previously collected data
4 units of assigned Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Start a new collaborative research project or use a secondary data set. - Work on manuscript(s) for publication in peer-reviewed journals, and a peer-reviewed conference podium presentation.
6 units of assigned Time (in one semester or across two semesters)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multiple phase research project and establishment of collaborations with internal or external researchers, and/or - External grant application proposal (deliverable), and - Student mentoring
Faculty Small Grant up to \$5000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New research project, or use secondary data set, and - Clear and justifiable budget, and - A plan for obtaining external funding (deliverable)
3 units of assigned Time + Faculty Small Grant up to \$1550 (equivalent to 1 unit of Reassigned Time)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New research project, or use secondary data set, and - Work on one publication in peer reviewed journal, and - Clear and justifiable budget, and - Plan for obtaining external funding
3 units of assigned Time + Faculty Small Grant up to \$3100 (equivalent to 2 units of Reassigned Time)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New research project, or use secondary data set, and - Work on one publication and a peer-reviewed conference podium presentation, and - Clear and justifiable budget, and - Plan for obtaining external funding
3 units of assigned Time + Faculty Small Grant up to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New research project or use secondary data, and - Work on at least two publications, and - Clear and justifiable budget, and

\$4650 (equivalent to 3 units of Reassigned Time)	- Plan for obtaining external funding
---	---------------------------------------