

Enhancement for Graduate Research Awards Proposal Review Rubric (Conduct Research)

This rubric is applicable to both individual and to group proposals.

Criterion	Unacceptable	Fair/Acceptable	Good	Excellent
Anticipated benefit to student/s for dissemination of research	<p>1-2</p> <p>Very weak in overall value to the student/s – not enough time, task challenge, and project quality to produce skill and knowledge development</p> <p>Low likelihood of tangible product</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>Modest in overall value to the student/s – limited time, task challenge, and project quality to produce skill and knowledge development</p> <p>Some possibility of limited product (e.g. internal presentation or thesis proposal)</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>Solid in overall value to the student/s –enough time, task challenge, and project quality to produce good skill and knowledge development</p> <p>Well justified likelihood of tangible product</p>	<p>7-8</p> <p>Exceptional – very impressive time, task challenge, and project quality to produce a high degree of skill, knowledge development</p> <p>Well justified likelihood of tangible product(s) beyond a local level (publication(s), national presentation(s))</p>
Writing	<p>1-2</p> <p>Writing is technically weak with many grammar and spelling errors</p> <p>Organization is poor</p> <p>Style is clumsy and not appropriate for comprehension by a non-technical audience</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>Writing is adequate, with few grammatical and spelling errors</p> <p>Organization is reasonable for the most part</p> <p>Style shows some effort to communicate to a non-technical audience, but often slips into unexplained technicalities</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>Writing is solid, with few grammar or spelling errors</p> <p>Organization is clear, concise, logical and generally effective</p> <p>Style is generally effective for communicating with a nontechnical audience but occasionally slips into unexplained technicalities</p>	<p>7-8</p> <p>Writing is exemplary, with no grammatical or spelling errors apparent</p> <p>Organization is clear, elegant, compelling</p> <p>Style is articulate, efficient, precise, and effective for communicating with a nontechnical audience</p>
Anticipated benefit, relevance, and intellectual merit of proposed activity	<p>1-2</p> <p>Very low likelihood the project will produce new knowledge in the student/s's field; lack of creative potential Little evidence of original student/s contribution to the work</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>Modest likelihood the project will produce new knowledge in the field; very modest creative potential</p> <p>Some evidence of original student/s contribution to the work</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>Solid likelihood the project will produce new knowledge in the field; clear creative potential, with likelihood that the project will have theoretical or applied significance and extend previous work</p> <p>Substantial evidence of original student/s contribution to the work</p>	<p>7-8</p> <p>Very high likelihood that the project will produce new knowledge in the field and have major significance</p> <p>The student/s's contribution to the work is central and essential</p>