

### S3 Application Scoring Rubric and Criteria - Updated for 2010 Application Process

Areas 1 through 5 below are given a score between 0 and 3. A total score will range from 0 – 17, with a score of 9 representing the border between a fundable proposal and an unfundable proposal (i.e., scores below 10 are automatically deemed unfundable). A score of 0 in any single category automatically results in the designation “unfundable.”

#### Area 1: Project Goals/ Scope

<i>3: High</i> Faculty description of project is easily understood by a non specialist reader and clearly articulates why the project is significant or of interest. Project is exceptionally appropriate for collaboration with an undergraduate student.	<i>2: Medium</i> Project description is reasonably clear to a non-specialist reader and articulates why the project is significant or interesting. Project is well suited for collaboration with an undergraduate student.	<i>1: Low</i> Project description is not easily understood by a non-specialist reader or it is unclear why the project is significant or of interest. The suitability of the project for collaboration with an undergraduate student is not clear.	<i>0: Unacceptable</i> Project description is unclear to a non-specialist reader or it is unclear why the project is significant or of interest. There are concerns about the suitability of the project for collaboration with an undergraduate student.
---	---	---	--

#### Area 2: Project Feasibility

<i>3: High</i> Detailed proposed timeline; the faculty member has demonstrated methodological expertise; there is evidence of careful, detailed consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project	<i>2: Medium</i> Proposed timeline; faculty member has appropriate methodological expertise; evidence of reasonable consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project	<i>1: Low</i> Proposed timeline; faculty member has appropriate methodological expertise; only minimal evidence of consideration of budgetary and other necessary resources	<i>0: Unacceptable</i> Timeline <i>or</i> budget appears unrealistic or poorly considered; <i>or</i> the faculty member does not seem to have appropriate methodological expertise; the need for Human or Animal Research approvals has not been considered
---	---	--	--

#### Area 3: Faculty Narrative: Quality of Student Learning Experience

<i>3: High</i> Clearly articulates and demonstrates the following components: student-centered mentoring goals; a plan for active collaboration with the student in research or creative practice, and a transition to independence in the student learning experience.	<i>2: Medium</i> Adequate demonstration of the following components: mentoring goals, a plan for active collaboration with the student in research or creative practice, transition to independence.	<i>1: Low</i> Inadequate demonstration of one or more of the following components: mentoring goals, a plan for active collaboration with the student in research or creative practice, transition to independence.	<i>0: Unacceptable</i> Does not demonstrate the following components: mentoring goals, a plan for active collaboration with the student in research or creative practice, transition to independence.
--	---	---	--

#### Area 4: Student Narrative: Qualifications and Motivation

<i>3: High</i> The student is highly qualified to pursue the project; the student statement reflects strong self-motivation and superior understanding of project goals and appropriate methodologies.	<i>2: Medium</i> The student is well-qualified to pursue the project; the student statement reflects self-motivation and good understanding of project goals and appropriate methodologies	<i>1: Low</i> The student has adequate preparation to pursue the project; student statement reflects reasonable understanding of project goals and appropriate methodologies, but little self-motivation	<i>0: Unacceptable</i> The student does not seem prepared to pursue the project; student statement reflects insufficient understanding of project goals or project roles; student statement is poorly written
---	---	---	--

#### Area 5: Commitment to Project

<i>3: High</i> Both student and faculty member are strongly committed to the project and are prioritizing it over all other research, creative activity, or employment.	<i>2: Medium</i> Both student and faculty member are clearly committed to the project and it is clearly a high priority for both.	<i>1: Low</i> Student and faculty member are prioritizing the project, but there are concerns about other commitments.	<i>0: Unacceptable</i> <i>Either</i> the student <i>or</i> the faculty member has not prioritized the project over other activities
--	--	---	--

#### Area 6: Dissemination Plan

<i>3: High</i>	<i>2: High</i> A plan for external dissemination of project results is proposed beyond SSD and S3 Showcase.	<i>1: Medium</i> A plan for internal dissemination of project results is proposed beyond SSD and S3 Showcase. (e.g., Brown Bag presentation, class presentation, public performance)	<i>0: Low</i> No plan for public dissemination of project results is proposed; or, the proposed plan is not feasible
----------------	--	---	---