URECA TEAM APPLICATION - Scoring Rubric
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

Faculty Components - 50% of score

	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
Faculty Introduction, Purpose, and Budget (if requested)	Lacks ability to create a meaningful research or creative project and to shape content into either a chronological or logical plan of implementation. 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. Budget is not directly associated with proposal and/or was not submitted.	Demonstrates limited skill in crafting a clear research or creative project that is supported by an equally clear plan of implementation. 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. Budget is present but is not adequate to support the project and/or could be better justified.	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 implementation. Appropriate contributions to the field. Appropriate critical thinking. Budget supports the project activities, costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives of the project, and budget is well justified.	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. Budget supports the project activities, costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives of the project, and budget is exceptionally justified.
Team Structure	Role, involvement, and activities of faculty mentor and team engagement is only vaguely presented. No details are outlined regarding structure, frequency of meetings, modality, discussion items.	Role, involvement, and activities of faculty mentor and team engagement is generally presented. A few details are outlined such as structure, frequency of meetings, modality, discussion items.	Role, involvement, and activities of faculty mentor and team engagement is clearly presented. Most details are outlined such as structure, frequency of meetings, modality, discussion items.	Role, involvement, and activities of faculty mentor and team engagement is carefully presented and explained. All details are outlined such as structure, frequency of meetings, modality, discussion items.
IRB/IACUC Approval	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.

Student Components - 50% of Score

	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
Does the student make a connection between the project outcomes and how they align to the student's major and/or career goals?	No connection between outcomes and how they align to the student's major and/or career goals.	Limited connection between project outcomes and how they align to the student's major and/or career goals.	Partially makes connection between project outcomes and how they align to the student's major and/or career goals.	Clearly makes connection between project outcomes and how they align to the student's major and/or career goals.
Does the student understand their role within the project and can they describe their role in their own words?	No understanding of their role within the project and/or does not describe it in their own words.	Limited understanding of their role within the project and/or limited ability to describe role in their own words.	Partial understanding of their role within the project and/or partial ability to describe role their own words.	Clearly understands their role within the project and describes it well in their own words.
Project Timeline	Timeline is unclear and impracticable.	Timeline is unclear and/or impracticable.	Timeline is clear and achievable.	Timeline is detailed, clear, and achievable.