UConn Co-op Legacy Fellowship Review Rubric – Summer 2019 Funding

Office of Undergraduate Research – University of Connecticut

Project Proposal Score:					
Project Proposal Scoring Rubric					
A – Exceptional	B – Very Good	C – Needs Improvement	D – Needs Significant Revision		
Proposal is well written with all parts clearly explained. The proposal demonstrates a preliminary plan for completing the proposed project. Clear evidence of significance and contribution to the field or community is provided. Project encompasses the Co-op core values. Student Qualifications Score:	Proposal is relatively clear, but uses some jargon and/or some definition is lacking. Proposal outlines a preliminary plan for completing the proposed project. Some evidence of significance and contribution to the field and/or community is provided. Project encompasses the Co-op core values.	Proposal gives a general picture of project goals and objectives, but does not provide an in-depth description. Proposal outlines a vague plan for completing the project. Proposal claims significance to the field and/or community but does not explain. Project relation to the Co-op core values is unclear.	Proposal has a number of weaknesses. Description is vague and goals and objectives are poorly outlined. A preliminary plan for completion is not provided. Proposal does not explain the significance of the project to the broader field and/or the community. Project does not align with the Co-op core values.		
<u> </u>	Student Qualifi	cations Scoring Rubric			
A – Exceptional	B – Very Good	C – Needs Improvement	D – Needs Significant Revision		
The qualifications and experience of the student are sufficient for carrying out the proposed project. The student's academic record and/or background knowledge and passion for the subject indicate appropriate preparation for engaging in self-directed project work.	The student has sufficient knowledge and preparation to carry out the proposed project. The proposal indicates strong interest in the subject and that the student has completed appropriate preparation for engaging in self-directed project work.	The student's qualifications, preparation and knowledge on the subject are not clear or may be insufficient for carrying out the proposed work. Additional research and investigation will need to be completed and/or knowledge gained to prepare the student to engage in self-directed project	The project proposal does not demonstrate sufficient background knowledge or qualifications to successfully engage in project work. The student's academic record and/or experience does not indicate sufficient preparation to engage in the self-directed project proposed.		

Applicant: ______ Reviewer: _____

	Project Significance for	or the Student Scoring Rubric	
A – Exceptional	B – Very Good	C – Needs Improvement	D – Needs Significant Revision
Application demonstrates significance of the project to the student's academic studies, future professional aspirations, and/or personal goals. The student's life experience, background, and/or goals indicate high potential for the project experience to be transformative.	Application explains how the work will benefit the student's academic studies, future professional aspirations, and/or personal goals. The student's life experience, background, and/or goals suggest the potential for the project experience to be transformative.	Application does not make a clear connection between the project and the student's academic studies, future professional aspirations, and/or personal goals. The student's life experience, background, and/or goals suggest the project experience might be transformative.	It is unclear from the application materials how this project or subject fits with the student's academic studies, future professional aspirations, and/or personal goals. The student's life experience, background, and/or goals suggest the project experience is unlikely to be transformative.
Budget Score:			
	Budget	Scoring Rubric	
A – Exceptional	B – Very Good	C – Needs Improvement	D – Needs Significant Revision
Budget is clearly explained and is appropriate for the activities proposed. Cost estimates are realistic and justified.	Budget provides a realistic estimate of project expenses, but lacks some detail.	Budget broadly categorizes project expenses but does not provide sufficient detail to clarify or justify expenses.	Proposed budget does not clearly state what requested funds would be used for, lacks sufficient detail or explanation, and/or is not appropriate for the activities proposed.
Strength of Recommendations	Score:		
	Strength of Recom	mendations Scoring Rubric	
A – Exceptional	B – Very Good	C – Needs Improvement	D – Needs Significant Revision
Letters of recommendation indicate strong support. Recommenders provide a positive assessment of the significance of the project and its potential educational value for the student. Letters include a positive assessment of the student's ability to undertake the project.	Recommendations provide a positive assessment of the student, the project proposed, and the educational value for the student.	Recommendations include a positive assessment of the student but do not address the project or the student's ability to successfully undertake the proposed project.	Recommendations focus on student's academic performance and do not indicate knowledge of or support of the proposed project.

Project Potential:					
Project Potential Scoring Rubric					
A – Exceptional	B – Very Good	C – Needs Improvement	D – Needs Significant Revision		
Project has strong and clearly articulated significance to the field and/or potential for impact on the broader community. The project clearly expresses the core values of public engagement, innovation, and social impact.	Project has potential for significance and/or impact. Core values of public engagement, innovation, and social impact are expressed	Weak connection between the project and the core values. Project has potential for impact and/or significance, though the impact is not clearly articulated.	Core program values are not expressed and potential for impact on the field and/or broader community is unclear.		

Summary of project strengths and weaknesses:
Suggestions to the applicant on how to improve the project: Applicants who receive awards will be encouraged to refine their proposals during the project development process. Your remarks and suggestions will be very helpful to them as they go through this process. This information is also important for OUR communications with
students who do not receive awards.

Please return your rankings to Melissa Berkey by fax (860-486-0222), attached to email (Melissa.berkey@uconn.edu), or by hand to ROWE/CUE 409. Many thanks!