2012-13 Common Rubrics for Evaluating Undergraduate Research Proposals Shippensburg University Undergraduate Research Program

Category	Excellent 5	Good 4	Average 3	Needs Improvement 2	Poor 1	Missing (0)	Category Weight	Category Score
A. Relevance and Significance of Topic	It is clear how the proposed activities fit into the broader scholarly or creative field. Others will benefit from the new knowledge, applications, or creative works produced through the project.	It is clear how the proposed activities fit into the broader scholarly or creative field.	A link is made between the proposed work and the broader creative or research field. The impact is modest.	A link is made between the proposed work and the broader creative or research field. It is not clear how the proposed activities will further the field as a whole, or how the scholarly community or others will benefit from the proposed activities.	Contributions of the proposed activity to the broader field or community are not clearly stated.		X 2	
B. Description of Project Including Adequacy of Design, Feasibility, and Likelihood for Success	Description is very clear and concise; easy to understand. Processes and procedures is well stated, manageable appropriate and comprehensive; project has ever reasonable expectation of being completed	Description is clear and generally easy to understand. There is a logical and thoughtful plan for executing the project.	The description is adequate though the need for greater clarity is apparent. Processes and procedures for executing the project appear management, but there is some uncertainty.	Description of what is being proposed is not clear. Processes and procedures outlined are also unclear or do not follow from objectives. Likelihood of success is questionable.	It is unclear what is being proposed. Processes and procedures are either omitted, only vaguely stated, or do not relate to the project proposed. The project as designed has little chance of being successful.		X 4	
C. Potential for Learning (in terms of academic and possibly career and personal development)	Project will significantly enhance student's academic development.	Project will enhance student's academic development.	Project may enhance student's academic development.	Ability to enhance student's academic development is less clearly demonstrated or less likely.	Project does not speak to student's development or only in the weakest manner.		X 2	

D. Role, Involvement and Activities of Student and Faculty Mentor Clearly Identified and Explained	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are carefully presented and explained. Roles are especially appropriate.	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are clearly presented. Roles are appropriate.	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are generally presented.	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are only vaguely presented.	The student's role is merely as a bystander or at the other extreme the role of the faculty mentor is only superficially presented.		X 1	
E. Appropriateness and Justification for Budget	Budget is reasonable and very directly related to project activities. All costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes. All costs are relevant and essential to this project. Funding is oriented toward supplies (as opposed to travel).	Budget is generally reasonable and directly related to project activities. Majority of costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes. Majority of costs are relevant and essential to this project.	Budget is not fully reasonable and less clearly related to project activities. Some costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes. Some costs are relevant and essential to this project.	Budget expenses are not reasonable and not clearly related directly related to project activities. Costs are partly justified in the budget narrative or notes. Some costs are partly relevant and essential to this project.	Budget is unreasonable in all areas. Costs are not justified in the budget narrative or notes. Many costs are not relevant and essential to this project. Funding is oriented toward travel (and not supplies).		X 3	
		TOTAL POINTS (Maximum 60)						

REQUIRED ELEMENTS:	Is the narrative 3 pages or less?		Has the faculty mentor approved the proposal and the budget as submitted?		Does the budget total in the proposal match the budget total submitted with the online registration?		Are the budgets for student(s) and faculty itemized separately?		If funding is for travel, is the conference name and/or travel purpose clearly identified?	
	☐ Yes	□ No	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Yes	□No