

KU Undergraduate Research Award (UGRA) Evaluation Rubric-Research projects

Disciplinary Context	1=Poor or Absent	2=Fair	3 = Good	4 = Exceptional	Score
1. Synthesizes other research on the topic and characterizes current trends in the research.	Vague discussion of field suggests lack of understanding or effort. No attempts at insights or analysis.	Vague discussion of cited works. Some conventional or underdeveloped insight or analysis is provided about individual work, but no connections are made.	Good discussion of cited works. Adequate depth of insight/analysis. Is able to describe research trends and connections that are clearly related to the proposed work.	Excellent discussion of cited works. Impressive depth of insight/analysis. Makes meaningful connections among cited works and communicates research trends that are clearly related to proposed work. Student has a firm grasp on relevant concepts.	
2. Explains how the proposed project fits into the disciplinary context.	No logical relationship exists between the topic and existing information in related areas of knowledge. Disciplinary foundations are not evident or are misused.	A weak relationship exists between the topic and existing information in related areas of knowledge. Proposal drifts from its disciplinary foundations.	A relationship exists between the topic and existing information in related areas of knowledge. Proposal is rooted in disciplinary foundations.	A clear relationship exists between the topic and existing information in related areas of knowledge. Clearly describes how the project will advance the field. Proposal is firmly rooted in disciplinary foundations.	
Project Design	0=Poor or Absent	1=Fair	2 = Good	3 = Exceptional	Score
3. Describes appropriate methods or techniques for the project, with explanation of choices.	Methods or approach is not described.	Inadequately explained or inadequate approach. There is no relationship	Student explains the approach and why the methods are good for the topic of study.	Shows evidence of exceptional insight and understanding of methodological issues in the discipline;	

		between what the student proposes to do and why.		methods are appropriate for topic and discipline.	
<p>4. Proposal outlines an achievable project with a realistic timeline for a semester-long project.</p> <p><i>**Note: While we want to encourage students to make provisions for key steps in the research process, we also do not want to only award those projects that are "safe." Feel free to give a student a higher score if there are more unknowns in a project because it is ambitious.**</i></p>	The scope of the proposal is unreasonable in terms of time and resources available. Student has not considered and made plans for key steps of the project.	The scope of the proposal is of some concern in terms of time and resources available. The student has considered and made plans for <u>some</u> steps of the project.	The scope of the proposal is moderately reasonable in terms of time and resources available. The student has considered and made plans for <u>most</u> steps of the project.	The scope of the proposal is reasonable in terms of time and resources available. The student has considered and made plans for <u>all</u> steps of the project.	
Research Writing Skills	0=Poor or Absent	1=Fair	2 = Good	3 = Exceptional	Score
<p>5. Proposal is clearly written for a non-expert audience and follows conventions for academic writing.</p>	Proposal includes an unacceptable number of grammatical errors. Proposal fails to properly cite sources. Description does not provide a general picture of the proposed activities or uses too much jargon.	The proposal includes some grammatical errors. Writing style is sometimes difficult to read. Description is hard to understand, verbose, or uses too much jargon.	The proposal includes occasional grammatical errors. Writing style is easy to follow. Description depicts the project well, but uses some jargon or is otherwise hard to understand.	The proposal is free from grammatical errors. Description is clear, concise, and uses appropriate non-technical language.	
Student Preparation	0=Poor or Absent	1=Fair	2 = Good	3 = Exceptional	Score
<p>6. <i>**Please focus on recent relevant coursework; we do not penalize students who have overcome a rough start to college.**</i></p>	Student lacks the skills or background necessary to carry out the project. No relevant coursework or training, or poor	Student has some of the skills or background needed to carry out the project. Vaguely relevant	Student has most of the skills or background needed to carry out the project. Completed relevant coursework and/or learned	Student is highly prepared for this project or has successfully started this research project after extensive	

	performance in coursework. Proposal does not address how student will gain needed skills to complete project.	coursework or training. Proposal gives some information about how student will gain skills needed to complete project.	necessary information, theory, techniques, etc. Proposal addresses how student will gain needed skills to complete project.	coursework or training. Proposal clearly addresses how student will gain needed skills to complete project.	
--	---	--	---	---	--