Eckley Summer Scholars and Artists Endowment - Proposal Rubric

Rating/Category	Excellent (9-10)	Good (6-8)	Fair (3-5)	Poor (0-2)
1. Project Description	The proposal identifies a motivating idea, problem, and/or question. It presents a clear project design with specificity about procedures and methods, including the analytic approach.	The proposal identifies a motivating idea, problem, and/or question and provides a general outline of project activities that includes procedures and methods.	The proposal does not identify a motivating idea/problem/question, and/or does not outline the proposed project activities.	The proposal does not identify a motivating idea/problem/question, nor outline the proposed project activities. It is not clear that the student understands the work to be completed.
2. Goals and Outcomes	The goals of the project are clearly stated. Specific products (presentations, publications, or other appropriate outcomes) are described and seem attainable.	The goals of the project are clearly stated. Products (presentations, publications, or other appropriate outcomes) are identified, but little detail is provided.	Project goals are referenced, but could be stated more clearly. Products are described only vaguely and/or seem unattainable.	The goals of the project are not clearly stated. Products are not described.
3. Originality/ independent of coursework	It is clear that the project will make an original contribution to the field. It is clear how the project is independent of semester coursework.	Originality is addressed but not clearly proven. Independence of coursework is addressed but not clearly.	Originality is questionable. Independence of coursework is questionable.	The proposal demonstrates inadequate awareness of related work. The relationship between the project and a broader scholarly or creative field is not articulated. Originality and independence of coursework is not addressed.
4. Description of previous work	The proposal includes a synthesis of existing, related research or creative work. It is clear how the project fits into the broader scholarly or creative field.	The proposal summarizes relevant research or creative work. It is clear how the project fits into the broader scholarly or creative field at the local (IWU) level.	The proposal references some related work. A link is suggested between the project and a broader scholarly or creative field, but it is not clearly stated.	The proposal demonstrates inadequate awareness of related work. The relationship between the project and a broader scholarly or creative field is not articulated.
5. Methodology or technique	Methodology/technique is clear and appropriate for the project. Timeline is feasible, detailed, and consistent with activities described.	Methodology/technique is clear and appropriate for the project. Timeline lacks some detail but project is manageable in the time frame described.	Methodology/technique may lack detail. Timeline does not correspond to proposed activities or does not allocate sufficient time for some activities.	Methodology/technique lacks detail or is inappropriate for the project. Timeline is unsuitable and/or unrealistic for activities described.
6. Student Role in Project	Student had creative input in the project's development. Student will play a central role in project activities, including analysis and dissemination of findings.	Student will play a central role in project activities, including analysis and dissemination of findings.	Student plays an important role in project activities, but will not be involved in analysis or dissemination of findings.	Student is mainly an observer or data collector. Student will not be involved in analysis or dissemination of findings.
7. Faculty Recommendation	Recommenders provide a positive assessment of the significance of the project and its educational value for the student. Letters include a positive assessment of the student's ability to undertake the project within the stated timeframe. A plan for supervision and mentorship for the summer is described.	Recommendations provide a positive assessment of the student, the project proposed, the timeline, and the educational value for the student. There is evidence that mentoring will be provided.	Recommendations include a positive assessment of the student but do not address the project or the student's ability to successfully undertake the proposed project within the stated time frame. Role of mentor is vague.	Recommendations focus on student's academic performance and do not indicate knowledge of or support of the proposed project. Mentorship is not addressed.
8. Student Qualifications	The student is well qualified and prepared to carry out the project.	The student has sufficient knowledge and preparation to carry out the project.	The student's qualifications, preparation and knowledge on the subject are not clear or may be insufficient to carry out the project.	The application does not demonstrate sufficient background knowledge or qualifications to successfully engage in the project
9. Need, Impact and Benefit	The student makes a convincing case for his/her need for the award. The student's life experience, background, and/or goals indicate high potential for the summer experience to be transformative.	The student makes a strong case for his/her need for the award. The student's life experience, background, and/or goals suggest the potential for the summer experience to be transformative	The student articulates his/her need for the award. The student's life experience, background, and/or goals suggest the summer experience might be transformative	The student does not express a clear need for the award. The student's life experience, background, and/or goals suggest the summer experience is unlikely to be transformative.
10. Overall Quality of Application	Application materials are well written and well organized. The project is understandable to a professional outside of the discipline.	Application materials are generally well written and well organized, but the application includes some jargon or is sometimes hard to understand for a professional outside of the discipline.	Application materials are not written well and/or not organized well. The project is not easily understandable to a professional outside of the discipline.	Application materials are hard to understand and may use much field-specific jargon. It may not be clear that the student wrote the materials him/herself.
Scoring	90-100 (Outstanding/Definitely Fund); 80-89 (High Priority for Funding); 70-79 (Medium Priority for Funding); 60-69 (Low Priority/Do Not Fund); <60 (Do Not Fund)			*2018*

IWU Rubric based on the Summer Undergraduate Research Fund rubric, Office of Undergraduate Research, University of Connecticut (used with permission)