

**UConn Co-op Legacy Fellowship – Change Grant Review Rubric**  
 Office of Undergraduate Research – University of Connecticut



**Applicant:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Reviewer:** \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide a score for each of the five categories using the scoring criteria outlined below.

<b>Project Potential Score: _____</b>			
<b>Project Proposal Scoring Rubric</b>			
<b>A – Exceptional</b>	<b>B – Very Good</b>	<b>C – Needs Improvement</b>	<b>D – Needs Significant Revision</b>
Proposal is well written. Goals and objectives are clearly articulated. The proposal demonstrates a preliminary plan for completing the project. Project has strong and clearly articulated significance to the field and/or potential impact on the broader community. Student has a realistic understanding of potential impact and a plan for measuring success/impact.	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. Student has a realistic understanding of potential impact. Proposal outlines a plan for measuring impact and success.	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 elaborate. Potential impact is overstated and/or unrealistic. Proposal provides minimal information on plan to measure impact and success.	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. Proposal does not include a means of measuring impact or success.
<b>Student Qualifications Score: _____</b>			
<b>Student Qualifications Scoring Rubric</b>			
<b>A – Exceptional</b>	<b>B – Very Good</b>	<b>C – Needs Improvement</b>	<b>D – Needs Significant Revision</b>
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 successfully engage in project work.	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.

**Project Significance for the Student Score: \_\_\_\_\_****Project Significance for the Student Scoring Rubric**

<b>A – Exceptional</b>	<b>B – Very Good</b>	<b>C – Needs Improvement</b>	<b>D – Needs Significant Revision</b>
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**

<b>A – Exceptional</b>	<b>B – Very Good</b>	<b>C – Needs Improvement</b>	<b>D – Needs Significant Revision</b>
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.

**Mentorship and Partnerships Score: \_\_\_\_\_****Mentorship and Partnerships Scoring Rubric**

<b>A – Exceptional</b>	<b>B – Very Good</b>	<b>C – Needs Improvement</b>	<b>D – Needs Significant Revision</b>
Student has secured an appropriate mentor who indicates strong support in the letter of recommendation. Mentor provides a positive assessment of the significance of the project and its potential educational value for the student, and a positive assessment of the student’s ability to undertake the project. If applicable, student has secured support from a collaborating organization.	Student has secured an appropriate mentor who is supportive of the project. Recommendations provide a positive assessment of the student and the educational value for the student. If applicable, student has secured support from a collaborating organization	Student has secured a project mentor. Mentor’s understanding of the proposed project is minimal or inconsistent with the student’s description of the project. Recommendation includes a positive assessment of the student but does not clearly address the project or the student’s ability to successfully undertake the proposed project. If applicable, letter of support from partner organization is vague and noncommittal.	Project mentor’s recommendation does not demonstrate a clear understanding of the proposed project or inconsistent with the student’s description of the project. Recommendation does not address the student’s ability to successfully undertake the proposed project. If applicable, letter of support from partner organization is vague and noncommittal.

**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](mailto:Melissa.berkey@uconn.edu)), or by hand to ROWE/CUE 409. Many thanks!**