

CNU Summer Scholars Research Application Rubric: 24 Points Possible



Student Applicant: _____

URC Reviewer: _____

Category	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Research novelty and impact: A strong case is made for the novelty and importance of the research.	Excellent: The proposed work is highly original and the results are expected to be important in the specific field of research, and perhaps even beyond.	Good: The proposed research or scholarly work is novel, and the work is interesting and important in the field of study.	Fair: The proposed work is incremental over past research and demonstrates some potential for impact in the specific field of research.	Poor: The proposed work is unoriginal and demonstrates no potential impact.
Methods: A specific plan for carrying out the research is provided. It is reasonable and justified in the provided timeline.	Excellent: Methods and outcomes are communicated clearly, and they are reasonable within the proposed timeline. Risky parts of the plan are identified; fallback options are provided as needed.	Good: Methods are communicated clearly and they are reasonable within the proposed timeline. The most risky parts of the plan are identified.	Fair: Methods are communicated but are hard to understand; they are mostly reasonable. There are minor concerns over feasibility or timeline.	Poor: Methods are not communicated clearly and/or they are not reasonable.
Writing presentation: The writing is compelling, scholarly, accessible, and careful.	Excellent: The proposal is clearly and compellingly written, and also understandable to a broad audience (i.e. non-experts in the field).	Good: The proposal is well-written, and mostly understandable to a broad audience.	Fair: The proposal is capably-written, and partially understandable to a broad audience.	Poor: The proposal cannot be understood by non-experts, and/or is too basic for scholarly writing.
Personal student outcomes: How will the proposed funding and work impact the student's future?	Excellent: The proposal provides a compelling and specific description of how this funding and experience will enhance the student's future opportunities and/or career outlook.	Good: The proposal describes how the program will be important in the student's personal and professional future.	Fair: The proposal describes some potential for impact on the student personally, but it is limited and vague.	Poor: The proposal has little-to-no mention of how the proposed work will impact the student personally.
Student preparation: The student's background and history are appropriate for the proposed project.	Excellent: The student's academic and/or scholarly background are well-suited to the proposed work, so much so that the student's ideas contribute critically to the project.	Good: The student is well-prepared for the proposed work.	Fair: The student is not completely prepared for the proposed work, but they can catch up quickly.	Poor: The student does not have the necessary coursework or training to undertake the proposed work.
Faculty collaboration: Proposal demonstrates collaboration between faculty and student(s); roles are clearly defined.	Excellent: Both student and faculty are engaged in the project, and have a strong working relationship. Roles of both student and faculty are well-defined and suited to each.	Good: Both student and faculty are suited to the project, and worked together in the past (perhaps in a class). Roles are well-defined.	Fair: The student-faculty team is adequately suited to the project, and their roles are mostly defined.	Poor: The team does not seem appropriate for the proposed project. Roles in the student-faculty partnership are unclear.

IRB or IACUC: Not needed Complete In progress (needs checking) Needed but not addressed

Overall Recommendation (circle one): Fund Do Not Fund

TOTAL POINTS: