RUBRIC – FUND FOR FACULTY PUBLICATIONS

Only eligible applications will be shared with committee members for review. This rubric is for evaluation and discussion purposes only. It does not constitute a vote regarding funding of the application.

NOTE: The same rubric is used for all types of work; scoring should reflect best practices and values in relation to the work type and fee type (e.g. open access status of a journal is more relevant for articles seeking funding for open access fees than for those seeking color printing fees).

Applicant:		Funding Round:	
Type of Work:		Amount Requested:	
Publisher/Outlet:		Full Fee Amount:	
Reviewer:		Review Date:	

Application Evaluation

Criteria	Rating	Points	Notes/Comments
Applicant rank/position	0 – Tenured Full Professor 1 – Tenured Associate Professor 3 – Assistant Professor OR Tenure Track		
Previously received this award?	0 – Yes 2 – No		
Co-Authorship	0 – External co-author(s) 1 – UNC faculty/staff co-author(s) or solo authorship 2 – UNC student co-author(s)		
Acceptance	0 – Not yet accepted 1 – Accepted		
Prompt 1 – Publisher/outlet supports access to research and sustainable scholarship (e.g., is fully open access (not hybrid), permits posting of full text in institutional repository, is non-profit or a university press, etc.)	Scale 0 (low) – 5 (high)		
Prompt 1 – Evidence of a quality, transparent publication outlet that is appropriate for the work	Scale 0 (low) – 5 (high)		
Prompt 2 – Demonstrated Need	Scale 0 – 5 (low: other funding was budgeted for publication fees; high: no other funding sources)		
Prompt 2 – Fee Reduction	0 – No discount/waiver requested 1 – Discount/waiver requested 2 – Received discount/waiver		
Quality of application (lack of errors, completeness/clarity of responses, etc.)	Scale 0 (low) – 5 (high)		
	Total (out of 30)		