Undergraduate Research Grant proposal evaluation rubric

Criterion	4	3	2	1
Strength of the proposed mentoring relationship	Proposed mentoring relationship Clear, well defined proposal; role of mentor clearly explained	Relatively clear proposal but lacking some definition; role of mentor is a bit vague	A number of weaknesses but scope of work is articulated; evidence of some mentoring provided	Proposal is vague and scope of work is poorly identified; no clear mentor role
Demonstrated significance of the project and merit of the work	Clearly assesses the role of the proposed project in the field	Provides some evidence of significance	Claims significance but lacks substance.	No sense of how the proposed project contributes to the field
Methodology or creative focus	Evidences clear understanding of methodology/creative focus	Methodology/creative focus is defined but not clearly	Lacks some understanding of methodology or creative focus	No evidence of methodology/creative focus
Potential for accomplishing the proposed project	Well defined budget and realistic detailed timeline	Budget and/or timeline realistic but missing some detail	Budget and/or timeline not realistic or clearly defined	Budget and/or timeline unrealistic or missing
The overall quality of the proposal	Outstanding	Commendable	Satisfactory	Weak

Total points: _____