

UROP GRANT PROPOSAL RUBRIC

	Fair	Good	Excellent
1) Proposal (25%)	Objectives of activity not entirely clear or well-supported from background provided, details needed; project plan with little structure, design deficient in many areas; methods vague; timeline vague, with few major milestones	Objectives of activity clear, but some additional background detail needed; project plan satisfactory, with few areas not properly structured; methods clear; timeline clear, with majority of milestones described	Objectives of activity clear and well-supported from background detail provided; project plan very well-structured; methods both clear and repeatable; timeline clear, milestones thoroughly described
2) Literature and bibliography (10%)	References few, not adequately framing or supporting proposed activity; many neither scholarly nor state-of-the-field; limited summary and synthesis of relevant background information; bibliography generally not formatted correctly following an editorial format (e.g., APA).	References generally framing and supporting proposed activity; generally scholarly, state-of-the-field; adequate summary and synthesis of relevant background information; bibliography generally formatted correctly following an editorial format.	References nicely framing and supporting activity; scholarly, state-of-the-field; strong summary and synthesis of relevant background information; bibliography consistently formatted correctly following an editorial format.
3) Budget and justification (15%)	Budget unclear, with inappropriate detail; may not be appropriate to complete proposed activity; justification lacking clarity, with little explanation offered for budget items; budget and justification not entirely correlated with objectives of activity; proposal details other sources of budgetary support, if appropriate.	Budget relatively clear and detailed; appropriate to complete proposed activity; justification generally clear sufficiently explaining most budget items; budget and justification correlated with objectives of activity; proposal details other sources of budgetary support, if appropriate.	Budget clear and detailed; appropriate to complete proposed activity; justification clear, thoroughly explaining each budget item; budget and justification are nicely correlated with objectives of activity; proposal details other sources of budgetary support, if necessary for completion of activity.
4) Overall writing (5%)	Manuscript relatively well-written; ideas under-developed, communicated adequately; some grammatical, spelling, and/or punctuation errors; requires editing and proof-reading	Manuscript well-written; ideas well-developed, communicated successfully; few minor grammatical, spelling, and/or punctuation errors; requires minor editing and/or proof-reading.	Manuscript very well-written; ideas very well developed, communicated effectively; no significant grammatical, spelling, and/or punctuation errors; carefully edited and proof-read.

	Fair	Good	Excellent
5) Academic preparation (10%)	Student(s) poorly prepared for activity; little relevant academic preparation; training or prior experience lacking; proposal does not clearly address how student will gain skills needed to complete activity.	Student(s) adequately prepared for activity; adequate academic preparation; some training, and/or prior experience; proposal addresses how student will gain skills needed to complete activity.	Student(s) well-prepared for activity; excellent academic preparation; adequate training or prior experience; proposal clearly addresses how student will gain skills needed to complete activity.
6) Faculty mentoring (10%)	Proposed mentoring relationship and/or role of mentor vague; frequency and regularity of meetings with student unclear.	Proposed mentoring relationship and role of mentor clear, designed to support student; regular meetings with student planned.	Proposed mentoring relationship clear and very well-designed to support student, while encouraging independence; frequent and regular meetings with student planned.
7) Student learning potential (20%)	Activity provides few opportunities to: acquire and apply new knowledge and skills; problem solve; work autonomously, as well as part of a collaboration; practice ethical behavior; reflect on scholarship; enhance communication skills; articulate relevance of activity to a broader audience; and otherwise develop professionally, while synthesizing their academic interests, professional interests, and career goals.	Activity provides some opportunities to: acquire and apply new knowledge and skills; problem solve; work autonomously, as well as part of a collaboration; practice ethical behavior; reflect on scholarship; enhance communication skills; articulate relevance of activity to a broader audience; and otherwise develop professionally, while synthesizing their academic interests, professional interests, and career goals.	Activity provides many opportunities to: acquire and apply new knowledge and skills; problem solve; work autonomously, as well as part of a collaboration; practice ethical behavior; reflect on scholarship; enhance communication skills; articulate relevance of activity to a broader audience; and otherwise develop professionally, while synthesizing their academic interests, professional interests, and career goals.
8) Other impact of activity (5%)	Novelty of activity vague, contribution to field unclear; little evidence of plan for dissemination of results from activity beyond RaCAS.	Activity somewhat novel, making a relatively new contribution; vague plan for dissemination of results from activity beyond RaCAS.	Activity novel, making a new and significant contribution to field; detailed plan for dissemination of results from activity beyond RaCAS.