Rubric for ISRCA Faculty/Student Development Award Proposals

Faculty applicant:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

| **Score** | **Item** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Project deliverables, milestones and timelines**  0 – Deliverables, milestone and timelines are unclear  2 – Deliverables, milestones and timelines clear but are not feasible  4 – Deliverables, milestones and timelines are not specific  6 – Deliverables, milestones and timelines are clearly stated and feasible |  |
|  | **Methods/Procedures**  0 – No methods are discussed  2 – Plan for carrying on the work is vague and poorly articulated  4 – Plan for carrying out the work is clear but not well referenced  6 – Proposal clear and well referenced methods |  |
|  | **Goals**  0 – Contains no statement of rationale and/or significance  2 – Statement is in general terms  4 – Statement is specific but not clear what the general plan for a viable product, prototype or grant  6- Clearly explains how the project will lead to revenue for NKU (prototype, product or grant) |  |
|  | **Roles**  0 – No discussion provided on student roles  2 – Discussion is poorly developed  4 – Complete discussion, but roles are not appropriate  6 - Complete discussion of roles, and roles are appropriate for the work |  |
|  | Quality of the Proposal 0 – Proposal is not written well and has extensive spelling/grammatical errors; applicant did not follow instructions in preparing the proposal  2 - Proposal has moderate amounts of spelling/grammatical errors  4 - Most of the instructions were followed & the proposal had few spelling/grammatical errors  6 – Quality of the proposal is excellent |  |
|  | **Intellectual Merit/Quality of research**  0 – Research is not of high quality  2 – Research quality is unclear from proposal  4 – Research will only marginally advances support for NKU  6 – Proposal is of the highest quality and has the potential to advance support for NKU |  |
|  | **Results**  0 – no plan external grant or minimally viable product  2 – unclear what the plan external grant or minimally viable product  4 – minimal plan for grant submission or development of a product  6 – proposal indicates the likelihood of a highly successful grant application or product |  |
| **Point Total** | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ out of 42 points |  |