RIAP. Evaluation & Scoring Criteria

Applicant	
Scheme	
Date	
Reference	
Fund	**Yes / No**

Quality of the Research and Innovation	
Development Opportunity	
Work plan and budget	
Total (out of maximum of 18)	

Quality of the Research and Innovation		
Exceptional	**6**	• Should be funded as a matter of the very highest priority. • The proposal's evidence and justification are fully and consistently provided, demonstrating a very strong rational for support. • The proposal will meet several of the UWTSD R&I priorities with a very high likelihood of achieving the started outcomes.
Excellent	**5**	• Should be funded as a matter of priority but does not merit the very highest priority rating. • The proposal's evidence and justification are fully and consistently provided, demonstrating an excellent rational for support. • The proposal will meet several of the UWTSD R&I priorities with a high likelihood of achieving the started outcomes.
Very Good	**4**	• Work that demonstrates high international standards of scholarship, originality, quality and significance. • The proposal's evidence and justification are consistently provided, demonstrating a very good rational for support. • The proposal will meet several of the UWTSD R&I priorities with a very good likelihood of achieving the started outcomes.
Satisfactory	**3**	• Work that demonstrates national or developing standards of scholarship, originality, quality and significance. • The proposal's evidence and justification are outlined, demonstrating a satisfactory rational for support, which could however be further developed. • The proposal will meet at least two of the UWTSD R&I priorities with a satisfactory likelihood of achieving the started outcomes. Some weakness will be evident.
Not Competitive	**2**	• Not suitable for funding. • The proposal's evidence and justification are outlined, but do not offer a convincing rational for support. • The proposal will meet at least one of the UWTSD R&I priorities but shows some weaknesses or flaws in meeting the started outcomes.
Unsatisfactory	**1**	• Not suitable for funding. • The proposal's evidence and justification are outlined, but do not offer a convincing rational for support. • The proposal will meet at least one of the UWTSD R&I priorities but shows considerable weaknesses and flaws, and are very unlikely to meet the stared outcomes

RIAP. Evaluation & Scoring Criteria

Development Opportunity		
Exceptional	**6**	• The proposed work presents a very strong and appropriate development opportunity for the applicant.
Excellent	**5**	• The proposed work presents a strong and appropriate development opportunity for the applicant.
Very Good	**4**	• The proposed work presents a good and appropriate development opportunity for the applicant, although this will not be as substantial as those scoring 5 and 6.
Satisfactory	**3**	• The proposed work presents a clear development opportunity for the applicant, although this may be better supported by other means or after further staff development has been put in place.
Not Competitive	**2**	• The proposed work does not present a clear development opportunity for the applicant.
Unsatisfactory	**1**	• The proposed work does not present a clear development opportunity for the applicant.
Work plan and budget		
Exceptional	**6**	• The proposal's delivery arrangements are clear and convincing and are likely to deliver a very considerable return on investment. • The proposal's budget is accurately costed and appropriate for the stated activities, levering additional support
Excellent	**5**	• The proposal's delivery arrangements are clear and convincing and are likely to deliver a good return on investment. • The proposal's budget is accurately costed and appropriate for the stated activities, offering very good value for money.
Very Good	**4**	• The proposal's delivery arrangements are clear and convincing, and will deliver some return on investment, although this may require further support. • The proposal's budget is accurately costed and appropriate for the stated activities.
Satisfactory	**3**	• The proposal's delivery arrangements are clear. Further support is likely to be required to deliver a return on investment. • The proposal's budget is accurately costed and appropriate for the stated activities.
Not Competitive	**2**	• The proposal's delivery arrangements are not clearly defined or are unlikely to lead to effective outcomes. • The proposal's budget is costed but offers poor value for money.
Unsatisfactory	**1**	• The proposal's delivery arrangements are not clearly defined or are unlikely to lead to effective outcomes. • The proposal's budget is inaccurately costed.

Scored and approve by:	
Signature:	
Date:	