

**Assessment Rubric for Undergraduate Research Experience and Creative Activity Proposals**  
**Middle Tennessee State University**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	POOR		FAIR		GOOD		EXCELLENT
	1 point - DO NOT FUND (Half Point = 2)		3 points - NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (Revise and resubmit) (Half Point = 4)		5 points - CONSIDER FUNDING (Half Point = 6)		7 points - FUND
<b>Proposal</b>	Lacks ability to create a meaningful research or creative project and to shape content into either a chronological or logical plan of configuration. Concepts, evidence, and definitions were omitted or inappropriate given the context, purpose or methods of the study. No meaningful contribution to the field. Absence of critical thinking.		Demonstrates limited skill in crafting a clear research or creative project that is supported by an equally clear plan of configuration. Concepts are poorly formed, ambiguous, or not logically connected, resulting in a project that lacks appropriate support. Limited contribution to the field. Minimal critical thinking.		Although minor revisions could lead to a greater effect, demonstrates skill in crafting a coherent, unified, and restricted research or creative project that is supported by an equally coherent, unified, and restricted plan of configuration. Appropriate contributions to the field. Appropriate critical thinking.		Articulates a clear, coherent, reasonable, and succinct research or creative project that is well supported by interesting, innovative, concepts and ideas. Excellent contribution to the field. Excellent critical thinking.
<b>Organization and neatness of the proposal</b>	The length of the narrative exceeds the suggested limit as indicated in the guidelines. 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 part, 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 identifying reasonably well the reasons and means to achieve the goal of the proposal.
<b>Role of mentor</b>	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are only vaguely presented.		Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are generally presented.		Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are clearly presented. Roles are appropriate and detailed.		Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are carefully presented and explained. Role of mentor is very detailed. Roles are especially appropriate and very detailed.
<b>Timeline</b>	Timeline is unclear and impracticable.		Timeline is unclear and/or impracticable.		Timeline is clear and achievable.		Timeline is detailed, clear, and achievable.
<b>Supplies Budget</b>	Budget is not directly associated with proposal and/or was not submitted.		Budget is present but is not adequate to support the project and/or could be better justified.		Budget supports the project activities, costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives of the project, and budget is well justified.		Budget supports the project activities, costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives of the project, and budget is exceptionally justified.
<b>IRB/IACUC Approval</b>	The need for IRB or IACUC approval was recognized and/or there was not mention of plans to submit an application.		The need for IRB or IACUC approval was mentioned, but an application has not yet been submitted.		IRB or IACUC approval has not been secured, but an application has been submitted.		IRB or IACUC approval has been secured.