

## Student Undergraduate Research Fellowship - Summer 2014 Evaluation Rubric

**Name of Student and Project Being Reviewed:** \_\_\_\_\_

Please complete the following sheet after reading the proposal – for each category of assessment, provide a score. Point values are in parentheses before descriptions. Please note: project description, research question or creative goal and methodology are weighted more heavily than other criteria.

Criteria	Exceptional	Very Good	Average	Fair	Poor	Score
<b>Project Description</b>	(8) - Description is clear, concise, and easy to understand. Even a non-specialist can understand the purpose and/or topic that will be studied.	(6) Description is clear and easy to understand but contains some undefined field-specific terminology that made the proposal less understandable or accessible to reader.	(4) Description is generally adequate but some aspects are vague and need further clarification or explanation.	(2) Description is vague and generally not easy to follow (e.g., utilizes a lot of field-specific jargon without explaining its significance).	(0) It is unclear what is being proposed.	
<b>Research question or creative goal</b>	(8) The goals or objectives of the project are clearly stated and described.	(6) The goals or objectives of the project are described well but could benefit from minor fine-tuning.	(4) The goals or objectives of the project are comprehensible but need further refinement/clarification.	(2) The goals or objectives of the project are insinuated but are not explicitly stated.	(0) The goals or objectives of the project are not clearly stated or are non-existent.	
<b>Methodology and design</b>	(8) The proposal clearly describes the methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used to complete the project. Based on their description, the approach is appropriate for the project and manageable.	(6) The proposal describes the methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used to complete the project but further fine-tuning/explanation is necessary. Otherwise, the approach seems appropriate and manageable.	(4) The proposal outlines the methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used to complete the project but further clarifications are necessary as to how these are appropriate or manageable.	(2) The proposal does not explicitly describe the methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used to complete the project but there are statements inferring some kind of methodological approach.	(0) The proposal is lacking any explicit or implicit description of methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used to complete the project.	

<b>Student learning outcomes clearly communicated</b>	(1) YES	(0) NO				
<b>Final product/proposed outcomes adequately represent project</b>	(1) YES	(0) NO				
<b>Dissemination plan provided</b>	(1) YES	(0) NO				
<b>Assessment / evaluation plan</b>	(1) YES, the mentor has put together a viable plan for assessing the student's work.	(0) NO, the mentor has not included a viable plan for assessing the student's work.				
<b>Supply and expense plan included with proposal</b>	(1) YES –expenses are considered and they have a plan in place to cover costs.	(0) NO – no consideration of costs provided.				
<b>Timeline</b>	(4) Timeline is clearly presented and shows that all project-described activities will be completed within a 10-week framework.	(3) Timeline is described and shows the activities that will be completed within a 10-week framework.	(2) Timeline is outlined based on a 10-week framework but does not clearly describe which activities will be completed or when.	(1) Timeline and/or activities are not presented clearly, or do not illustrate what will be completed within a 10-week framework.	(0) Proposal has no timeline of activities, or the timeline is clearly not suitable for the activities described.	
<b>Student Statement</b>	(4) Professional goals are listed and the statement clearly reflects how this research project will help the student meet those goals.	(3) Professional goals are listed and the statement generally describes how this project can help the student meet the goals.	(2) Statement outlines student's professional goals but does not explicitly describe how they will be attained through this research project.	(1) Professional goals are hinted at, but not expressly stated.	(0) Statement does not reflect the student's professional goals; or no statement included in the proposal.	
<b>Quality of writing/ grammar/ spelling</b>	(4) Proposal and Statement are written clearly, logically and intelligibly, with no errors in spelling or grammar.	(3) Proposal and Statement are written clearly, logically and intelligibly but have minor errors in spelling or grammar.	(2) Proposal and Statement are written logically and intelligibly but have numerous errors; or few errors but lack clarity and a high quality of writing.	(1) Proposal and Statement are not very clear, there are no logical connections, and there are many errors.	(0) Proposal is poorly written, with frequent errors in spelling or grammar.	

<b>Proposal is within the 3 page limit</b>	(1) YES	(0) NO				
<b>Project is appropriate for URSCA</b>	(4) Project and mentor-student collaboration are fully appropriate for and meet the provided URSCA definitions.	(3) Project and mentor-student collaboration seem appropriate for and meet the provided URSCA definitions.	(2) Project seems appropriate for and meets the provided URSCA definitions but the mentor-student collaboration is not clearly described.	(1) Project seems appropriate for and meets the provided URSCA definitions but the mentor-student collaboration is not described.	(0) Project is not appropriate for or does not meet the URSCA definitions.	
<b>What is your recommendation of this project for the fellowship? (check one)</b>	Highly recommend	Recommend	Recommend with reservations (explain below)	Do not recommend		

**Total Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer comments:**

---

Signature

Date

## Definition of Undergraduate Research

The Council on Undergraduate Research's (CUR's) **definition of undergraduate research:** *An inquiry or investigation conducted by an undergraduate student that makes an original intellectual or creative contribution to the discipline.*

The Arts and Humanities Division of CUR adds some more specifics to the **definition:**

Undergraduate research in the arts and humanities is student-driven, faculty-mentored inquiry, scholarly investigation, and/or creative activity. The undergraduate researcher's work may contribute to outcomes including, but not limited to, individual or collaborative analytical writing; oral presentation; small analytical products; works of visual art; compilations of scholarship; exhibits; musical compositions; plays; performance; public scholarship; and/or peer-reviewed publication. Whatever the research product, its value is generally weighed by standards specific to experts in the field, whether jurors, editors, or reviewers.

UW-Superior generally subscribes to the definitions offered by CUR. The phrase “undergraduate research, creative and scholarly activity” (URSCA) is used to provide more inclusive language.