

Summer Scholars Program Faculty Application Scoring Rubric

Proposal Section	Score					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
Introduction	The introduction to the research or scholarly project is missing.	The introduction to the research or scholarly project is missing, too brief, or too discipline specific to be helpful.	The introduction to the research or scholarly project is adequate.	The introduction to the research or scholarly project is good, but lacks some detail on objectives or significance. Clarity for an interdisciplinary audience needs improvement.	Introduction is clear and written for an interdisciplinary audience. Objectives are stated, and significance to the field is above average.	Introduction is very clear and written for an interdisciplinary audience. Objectives are stated, and significance to the field is excellent
Mentor Philosophy	A description of goals and philosophy is missing or too vague to score.	Description of goals or mentor/mentor roles are incomplete, lack thoughtful mentorship, or student learning opportunities.	Philosophy of how to guide student in the discovery and scholarly process is stated, mentor responsibilities are identified, and appears to provide professional growth of student.	Philosophy of how to guide student in the discovery and scholarly process is clear, mentor responsibilities toward mentorship are defined, and value professional growth of student.	Philosophy of how to guide student in the discovery and scholarly process is clear and thoughtful, mentor responsibilities and concerns for student allow for significant mutual benefit.	Philosophy of how to guide student in the discovery and scholarly process is intentional and very well articulated, mentor responsibilities and concerns for student allow for significant mutual benefit. Prospects for rich interaction and professional growth of student is excellent.
Goals and Timeline	The Goals and Timeline are missing.	The Goals and Timeline are not reasonable, either too aggressive or expectations are too low, or are unclear for evaluation.	The Goals and Timeline are reasonable with regard to expectations and work attempted. Details are listed and seem feasible.	The Goals and Timeline are reasonable with regard to expectations and work attempted. Details are listed and seem feasible.	The Goals and Timeline are well thought out and reasonable, with regard to expectations and work attempted.	The Goals and Timeline are very well thought out and reasonable, with regard to expectations and work attempted. Weeks are identified with anticipated progress is assumed.
Budget Justification	Budget is missing.	Budget is incomplete, shows inefficient use of funds.	Budget justification is complete but may benefit from more detail or clarity.	Budget is provided and attempts to justify expenses. Additional details would be helpful.	Budget is clear and justified (e.g., itemized list of expenses).	Budget is clear and justified (e.g., itemized list of expenses). PI shows good use of funding
Overall Quality	Application is unacceptable.	Application is incomplete, unprofessional (e.g., spelling, grammar, formatting errors), or did not follow requested format.	Application follows the requested format and provides requested information.	Application is formatted correctly, PI provides requested information to support the objective of the project.	Application is organized, and provides clear information to support the objective of the project.	Application is highly organized, and provides clear information to support the objective of the project. Students learning is very clear.