Rubric for ISRCA Proposals

Project/Student:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 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 |  |
|  | **Rationale & Significance**  0 – Contains no statement of rationale and/or significance  2 – Statement is in general terms  4 – Statement is specific but it is not convincing in terms of items below  6- Clearly explains how the project meets a NKU or society need; and builds on current strengths and approaches |  |
|  | **Roles**  0 – No discussion provided on student and faculty 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 |  |
|  | **Budget**  0 – Budget is unreasonable; justification is not clear  2 – Goals and objectives are clearly not in-line with budget  4 – Goals, objectives and budgets are aligned, but not reasonable  6 – Goals, objectives and budget are clearly aligned and reasonable |  |
|  | 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 advance the frontiers of the research area  6 – Proposal is of the highest quality and has the potential to advance the frontiers of research |  |
| **Point Total** | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ out of 42 points |  |