

The Office of Undergraduate Research, Lamar University

Assessment Rubric for Undergraduate Research Proposals

Name(s) of Student Researcher(s):

Title of Proposal (first 3 words):

Part 1. – Scores will be only integer numbers

Criteria	Unacceptable (0)	Developing (1 – 2 – 3)	Accomplished (4 – 5 – 6)	Exemplary (7 – 8 – 9 – 10)
Intellectual merit, clarity in technical language, and originality of the idea	Never mentioned or inappropriately presented.	Elements are poorly formulated, ambiguous, or not logically connected to the description of the problem, purpose or research methods.	The proposal shows evidence for creation of new knowledge in the discipline, indicates originality, and adopts a technical language that is appropriate for student level.	The proposal has clear potential for creation of knowledge in the discipline, uses an appropriate technical language and shows evidence that is an original idea.
Methodology, Research Design, Thesis, or Purpose	Methodology is missing. The research design or thesis has not been identified and or described using standard terminology. Limitations or assumptions are omitted.	The methodology and research design or thesis are confusing or incomplete given the research questions. Important limitations or assumptions have not been satisfactorily identified.	The methodology and the research design or thesis have been identified and described in sufficiently detailed terms. Some limitations and assumptions were identified.	The purpose, questions, and design or thesis are mutually supportive and coherent. The methodology is appropriate. The important limitations and assumptions have been clearly stated.
Project output and outcome, including broader impact	No output and outcome have been identified. The project has clearly no impact in the discipline or benefit for the society.	The project output and outcomes are unclear or stated superficially. Limited broader impact can be foreseen from the proposal.	The project output and possible outcomes are stated, and some broader impact is expected.	The project output and outcomes are clearly stated, and broader impact is evident.
Relevant literature review for the proposed project	No literature review and no references are included in the proposal that are relevant.	Minimal literature review and not sufficient or irrelevant references are included in the proposal.	Literature review has been done at a low satisfactory level and some relevant references are included.	Literature review is clearly presented with enough relevant references listed and discussed.
Organization and general quality of proposal	The length of the narrative exceeds the suggested limit as indicated in the solicitation. The ideas are presented in a random manner with no focus.	The content and length of the proposal are inadequate (i.e. there is some logic in the narrative, but the ideas lack of clear focus and structural argumentation).	Proposal format has been followed mostly. The narrative presents the ideas in an almost structural and logical manner.	The narrative has the appropriate length, and the ideas are presented in a clear structural and logic manner to achieve the goal of the proposal.

Total (max is 50pts):

Part 2. – Scores will be only integer numbers

Criteria	Missing or unacceptable (deduct 3)	Accomplished (add 1 – 2 – 3)	Exemplary (add 4 – 5)
Proposed budget and budget justification	Budget or budget justification are missing.	Budget or budget justification are present but not very clear or easy to understand.	Budget or budget justification are adequate to support the project activities, costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives of the project, and the budget is clear to understand.
Letters of recommendation	The faculty mentor’s support letter is missing, or the letter doesn’t indicate at all that the project can be done within the period of the grant.	The faculty mentor’s support letter doesn’t strongly indicate that the student has enough qualification to run the project, or it cannot be done within the period of the grant.	The faculty mentor’s support letter strongly indicates that the research project is significant and gives strong evidence that the student has the qualifications to carry out the project successfully within the grant period.

Total (max is 10pts):

Overall Total (max is 60 pts):

Part 3. Please type-in below two paragraphs of summary indicating (1) the strengths and (2) the weaknesses of the proposal. These comments will be shared with the student submitter(s) and their mentor(s), and therefore should be formulated in an articulated and constructive way.

A reviewer report should include these written comments, as mandatory part of the reviewer’s function and role in the process. Without these two paragraphs submitted along with the scores, the review will not be accepted, and it will be sent back to reviewers for completion. We are grateful to reviewers for their time, effort, and diligent work in providing constructing advice formulated in an appropriate academic language.

(1) Strengths of the proposal:

(2) Weaknesses of the proposal:

Please give us your overall recommendation for this proposal: to be Accepted or to be Rejected.