UConn IDEA Grant Proposal Review Rubric – Group Applications
Office of Undergraduate Research – University of Connecticut

Group Project Title: _____Reviewer:_____

Section 1: Group Project Proposal

Please provide a score for each of the three Section 1 group categories below using the scoring rubrics provided. The scoring in this section is based on answers to application questions completed as a group; individual group members will be scored separately in Section 2.

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. Idea originates from the group and project is the group's own design. Proposal shows creativity and originality. The proposal demonstrates a clear plan for completing the proposed project. Clear evidence of significance and contribution to the field is provided.	Proposal is relatively clear, but uses some jargon and/or some definition is lacking. Project shows creativity and originality, and is of the group's own design. Proposal outlines a plan for completing the proposed project. Some evidence of significance and contribution to the field and/or community is provided.	Proposal gives a general picture of project goals and objectives, but does not provide an in-depth description. Project contains original, innovative or creative aspects, but the extent to which the project is of the group's own design is unclear. Proposal outlines a vague plan for completing the project. Proposal claims significance to the field and/or community but does not explain.	Proposal has a number of weaknesses. Description is vague and goals and objectives are poorly outlined. The proposal lacks evidence that the project is of the group's own design. A plan for completion is vague or not provided. Proposal does not explain the significance of the project to the broader field and/or the community.

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. Stipend request is clearly justified.	Budget provides a realistic estimate of project expenses, but lacks some detail. Stipend request is adequately justified.	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 not appropriate for the activities proposed.

Timeline & Feasibility Score: _____

Timeline & Feasibility Scoring Rubric			
A – Exceptional	**B – Very Good**	**C – Needs Improvement**	**D – Needs Significant Revision**
The timeline is feasible, manageable and appropriate for the proposed project, demonstrating clear understanding of the time frame for proposed activities. Achievable project goals and milestones are outlined. If necessary, research approvals have been obtained or there is a plan outlined for obtaining approvals.	Timeline is feasible, manageable, and appropriate for the proposed project. Achievable project goals and milestones are outlined. If necessary, research approvals have been obtained or there is a plan outlined for obtaining approvals.	Basic outline of project milestones is provided. Lacks detail but with further development and/or modifications during the project development course could be a feasible timeline. The feasibility of obtaining research approvals (if necessary) may be uncertain.	Proposed timeline lacks sufficient detail or is overly ambitious. It is unclear what steps the group intends to take to complete the proposed project. Goals and project milestones are vague or undefined. The feasibility of obtaining research approvals (if necessary) is unclear, even with project alterations.

Project Potential: _____			
The UConn IDEA Grant Program builds in a period of project development supervised by OUR staff that allows grantees time to refine the scope of their project in light of feedback from the review committee, to finalize their timeline and budget, and to solidify mentorship arrangements. Please evaluate the overall project potential, taking into consideration the extent of necessary modifications and the opportunity for further development and refinement with guidance from the project supervisor and OUR staff during the project development period.			
A –Very Good	**B - Good**	**C – Needs Improvement**	**D – Needs Significant Revision**
Project could benefit from or be strengthened by minor modifications and refinements. Project is viable and has the potential for significant student learning.	Project needs some modifications and/or refinement, though with further development and guidance through project development activities, the project can be made viable and has the potential for significant student learning.	Project requires further development and/or refinement of scope. Through project development activities and with guidance the project can be made viable. Project has potential for significant student learning.	Project requires significant revisions and modifications; student should be encouraged to reapply once major revisions have been made.

Section 2: Individual Group Member Application Questions

Please provide a score for each of the three categories for each group member using the scoring rubrics provided below the table. The scoring in this section is based on answers to application questions completed by individual group members.

Individual Group Member Scores

Group Member 1 Name:	Group Member 2 Name:
• **Student Qualification and Preparation Score:** _____ • **Project Significance for the Student Score:** _____ • **Strength of Recommendations Score:** _____	• **Student Qualification and Preparation Score:** _____ • **Project Significance for the Student Score:** _____ • **Strength of Recommendations Score:** _____
Group Member 3 Name:	Group Member 4 Name:
• **Student Qualification and Preparation Score:** _____ • **Project Significance for the Student Score:** _____ • **Strength of Recommendations Score:** _____	• **Student Qualification and Preparation Score:** _____ • **Project Significance for the Student Score:** _____ • **Strength of Recommendations Score:** _____

Scoring Rubrics for Individual Group Member Application Questions

Student Qualification & Preparation Scoring Rubric			
A – Exceptional	**B – Very Good**	**C – Needs Improvement**	**D – Needs Significant Revision**
The qualifications, preparation and experience of the student are sufficient for carrying out their project components or contributions. The student's academic record and/or background knowledge and passion for the subject indicate probable success of the project.	The student has sufficient knowledge and preparation to carry out their project components or contributions. The proposal indicates strong interest in the subject and adequate preparation for engaging in the proposed 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.	The student does not demonstrate sufficient background knowledge or qualifications to successfully engage in the proposed project work and/or the students' academic record does not indicate sufficient preparation.

Project Significance for the Student Scoring Rubric			
A – Exceptional	**B – Very Good**	**C – Needs Improvement**	**D – Needs Significant Revision**
Application demonstrates significance of the project to the students' 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.

Strength of Recommendations 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.

Section 3: Proposal Summary and Suggestions for Improvement

Your judgments about the strengths and weaknesses of proposals will inform discussion within the review committee and help with committee decision-making. Applicants who receive awards will be encouraged to refine their proposals during the project development course. 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.

Summary of project strengths and weaknesses:

Suggestions to the applicants on how to improve the project:

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