Undergraduate Research Mini-Grant Evaluation Rubric
University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Scholarly Merit of Project	0=Poor or Absent	1=Fair	2 = Good	3 = Exceptional
1. Background. Synthesizes other work in the field and characterizes current trends in the research.	Vague discussion of field suggests lack of understanding or effort. No attempts at insights or analysis.	Vague discussion of cited works. Some conventional or underdeveloped insight or analysis is provided about individual work, but no connections are made.	Good discussion of cited works. Adequate depth of insight/analysis. Is able to describe research trends and connections that are clearly related to the proposed work.	Excellent discussion of cited works. Impressive depth of insight/analysis. Makes meaningful connections among cited works and communicates research trends that are clearly related to proposed work. PI has a firm grasp on relevant concepts.
2. Disciplinary Context. Explains how the proposed project fits into the disciplinary context. Also impact of project to discipline.	No logical relationship exists between the topic and existing information in related areas of knowledge. Disciplinary foundations are not evident or are misused.	A weak relationship exists between the topic and existing information in related areas of knowledge. Proposal drifts from its disciplinary foundations.	A relationship exists between the topic and existing information in related areas of knowledge. Proposal is rooted in disciplinary foundations.	A clear relationship exists between the topic and existing information in related areas of knowledge. Clearly describes how the project will advance the field. Proposal is firmly rooted in disciplinary foundations.
Project Design				
3. Method. Describes appropriate methods or techniques for the project, with explanation of choices.	Methods or approach is not described.	Inadequately explained or inadequate approach. There is no relationship between what the student proposes to do and why.	PI explains the approach and why the methods are good for the topic of study.	Shows evidence of exceptional insight and understanding of methodological issues in the discipline; methods are appropriate for topic and discipline.
4. Timeline. Proposal outlines an achievable project with a realistic timeline for a semester-long project (can end as late as July 31, 2016).	The scope of the proposal is unreasonable in terms of time and resources available. PI has not considered and made plans for key steps of the project.	The scope of the proposal is of some concern in terms of time and resources available. The PI has considered and made plans for some key steps of the project.	The scope of the proposal is moderately reasonable in terms of time and resources available. The PI has considered and made plans for most steps of the project.	The extent of the proposed study is reasonable in terms of time and resources available. The PI has considered and made plans for all steps of the project.

Research Writing Skills				
5. Writing. Proposal is clearly written for a non-expert audience and follows conventions for academic writing.	Proposal includes an unacceptable number of grammatical errors. Proposal fails to properly cite sources. Description does not provide a general picture of the proposed activities or uses too much jargon.	The proposal includes some grammatical errors. Writing style is sometimes difficult to read. Description is hard to understand, verbose, or uses too much jargon.	The proposal includes occasional grammatical errors. Writing style is easy to follow. Description depicts the project well, but uses some jargon or is otherwise hard to understand.	The proposal is free from grammatical errors. Description is clear, concise, and uses appropriate non-technical descriptions and terms.
Funding of Research				
6. Budget. The proposal must provide a brief explanation of how the funds will be used for the project.	PI has no explanation/documentation of how the funds will be used for grant project.	PI has some documentation of how the grant funds will be utilized for the project.	NA	PI provided a brief explanation of how the grant funds will be used for project implementation. (Does not need a formal budget)
Impact on Students				
7. Impact. The proposal should make a significant impact on the students involved.	There is little or no evidence of significant student learning. For example, the grant may simply propose to purchase equipment.	Student learning is likely to be limited to rudimentary cognitive tasks, such as remembering or understanding existing knowledge.	Student learning will include medium-level cognitive tasks such as applying and/or analyzing.	Student learning will include high-level cognitive tasks such as evaluating and/or creating.
8. Number of students involved.	No identification of any specific students being directly involved. If students are mentioned, no plan is presented to recruit the students.	One or two specific students will be involved. If specific students are not already identified, a reasonable plan for getting students is identified.	Three or four specific students will be involved. If specific students are not already identified, a reasonable plan for getting students is identified.	Five or more specific students will be involved. If specific students are not already identified, a reasonable plan for getting students is identified.

Strengths of the Proposal:

Undergraduate Research Mini-Grant Evaluation Rubric
University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Areas for Improvement:

Score _____/ 24